



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>







HISTORY OF PREACHING

FROM THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS TO
THE GREAT REFORMERS

A. D. 70—1572

BY

EDWIN CHARLES DARGAN, D.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF HOMILETICS IN THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY, LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

*Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω
ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν, εὐδόκησεν
ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος σῶσαι
τοὺς πιστεύοντας.—I Cor. 1: 21.*

NEW YORK

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON

2 AND 6 WEST 18TH STREET, NEAR 5TH AVENUE

1905

Divinity School.

COPYRIGHT, 1905, BY
A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON
Published January, 1905

BV
4207
.D32
v. 1

Press of J. J. Little & Co.
Astor Place, New York

TO THE
CHERISHED AND REVERED
MEMORY OF

JOHN ALBERT BROADUS

A PUPIL'S
GRATEFUL OFFERING



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.	3
PERIOD I. A. D. 70-430.	
CHAPTER I. PREACHING DURING THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES	29
CHAPTER II. THE CULMINATION OF ANCIENT PREACHING IN THE FOURTH CENTURY	60
PERIOD II. 430-1095.	
CHAPTER III. THE DECLINE OF PREACHING IN THE FIFTH AND SIXTH CENTURIES	105
CHAPTER IV. THE LOW ESTATE OF PREACHING IN THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CENTURIES	129
CHAPTER V. VOICES IN THE NIGHT, OR PREACHING DURING THE NINTH, TENTH AND ELEVENTH CENTURIES . . .	154
PERIOD III. 1095-1361.	
CHAPTER VI. HERALDS OF THE DAWN IN THE ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH CENTURIES	174
CHAPTER VII. THE CULMINATION OF MEDIÆVAL PREACHING IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY	218
CHAPTER VIII. DECLINE AND MYSTICISM IN THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES	262
PERIOD IV. 1361-1572.	
CHAPTER IX. THE RENAISSANCE, AND PREACHING IN THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES	289
CHAPTER X. PREACHERS OF THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES	316
CHAPTER XI. THE REFORMATION, AND PREACHING IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY	358

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHAPTER XII. PREACHERS OF THE REFORMATION IN GER- MANY AND GERMAN SWITZERLAND	383
CHAPTER XIII. PREACHERS OF THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE AND OTHER EUROPEAN LANDS	430
CHAPTER XIV. PREACHERS OF THE REFORMATION IN ENG- LAND AND SCOTLAND	473
CHAPTER XV. ROMAN CATHOLIC PREACHING AND PREACHERS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY	524
CHAPTER XVI. PREACHING AT THE THRESHOLD OF THE MODERN WORLD	552
BIBLIOGRAPHY	565
INDEX	568

PREFACE

The following work is the fruit of studies pursued and judgments formed during eleven years of service as professor of Homiletics in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, at Louisville, Kentucky. It was the custom of the distinguished and lamented Dr. John A. Broadus, the first incumbent of that chair, to give every year instructive and delightful lectures on the History of Preaching. Under his inspiring teaching my interest as a student was awakened in the subject, and when years afterwards it fell to me first to share his labors of instruction and then to succeed to them, I became more and more deeply interested in the historical part of the course in Homiletics.

The remarkable lack of treatises on the History of Preaching, especially in English, early impressed me, and aroused a desire to do something, however little, towards supplying the need. The difficulty of the task and the pressure of other and heavy burdens have occasioned many misgivings and delays, and there have been of necessity changes of plan in the execution of the work. As now planned the present volume is the first of three proposed books. It deals with the history up to and including the Reformation, the next will treat of Modern European preaching, and the last will present a History of Preaching in the United States. Some material is in hand for these later works, and should this one be fortunate enough to find a public, and should life and leisure be granted me, I hope in time to produce them.

For the completion of the present volume opportunity was kindly afforded by the Trustees of the Seminary in granting me leave of absence for some months to visit Europe. While abroad from June, 1902, to January, 1903, I had time not only to write up much material already gathered, but to visit some of the places made famous in the history of the pulpit, and to read somewhat in a number of the great libraries, including those at Berlin,

Leipzig, Rome, Zurich, Geneva, and Paris. I am indebted for courtesies to the managers at these and other places.

In the use of the materials which I had to study, both at home and abroad, three methods have found place: (1) Much of the work done and critical judgments reached is based on personal and independent study of the original sources; (2) Much more, however, is of that mingled sort which rests partly and often chiefly on the work of others, and yet has been confirmed, enlarged or modified by contact with the sources; (3) In a few cases, where circumstances warranted or seemed to require it, I have simply adopted information obtained or views expressed by others. I have endeavored, either in the text or footnotes, to give the requisite indications as to which method has been used. But every one who has attempted this kind of writing knows how utterly impossible it is in all cases to distinguish sharply between what may be properly regarded as the author's own work, and that which he owes to others. I can only say that I have tried to make an honest book, and hereby cheerfully acknowledge my great indebtedness to many excellent workers in this field. I trust the book may find, both among my brethren of the Christian ministry and among others, readers who in their turn may find some pleasure and profit in perusing even so imperfect a presentation of the History of Preaching.

E. C. D.

Louisville, Kentucky, December, 1904.

INTRODUCTION

I. THE NEED OF A HISTORY OF PREACHING

The history of preaching has not yet been adequately written. A few works, all of them more or less fragmentary and incomplete, deal with the subject as a whole; a larger number, some of them remarkably good and satisfactory, treat of particular epochs or phases of the history; some attention, incidental and often superficial, has been given to preaching by writers of general, ecclesiastical, and literary histories; and this is all. A thorough, comprehensive, well-proportioned and reasonably complete account of preaching in all periods and countries does not exist, either as the great work of a single author or as a connected series of studies by different authors.

This lack of suitable historic treatment has been variously noticed by different writers. Thus Van Oosterzee,¹ in commenting on the lack of historic knowledge among preachers themselves concerning their work, says, "There is still wanting a good history of the art of preaching from the earliest times to the present day;" and further, "The wish cannot be suppressed that a qualified and vigorous hand might yet be impelled satisfactorily to fill up this gap in the historic-theologic literature." Christlieb,² in noticing the failure yet to produce an "all-round, satisfying, comprehensive history," seems to give up the expectation as hopeless, because no one is likely to have the "capacity and leisure" for so vast an undertaking. A recent French Catholic writer, the Abbé Boucher,³ rather lightly dismisses the matter with the remark that such a work would be unnecessary as it would really be a history of the progress of Christianity. This is too superficial a view; and the suggestion of Christlieb is no more appropriate for the history of

¹ *Practical Theology* (Am. ed.), pp. 67, 68.

² *Geschichte der Predigt*, article in the Herzog-Plitt *Real-Encyclopädie*, Bd. 18, S. 466.

³ *L'Eloquence de la Chaire*, Introduction.

preaching than for other subjects which cover vast fields, long periods, and practically limitless materials.

The materials for writing the history of the Christian pulpit are abundant, for some epochs superabundant. Only for a few and comparatively unimportant periods and departments of the subject is there scarcity. These materials consist, first of all, in the innumerable biographies and sketches of preachers of all ages and lands, and in the practically infinite quantity of published sermons. Then account must be taken of ecclesiastical histories and archaeologies, as these are obviously very closely related to preaching. And then the histories of civilization and of literature contain much that bears on preaching, directly and indirectly; and of course some knowledge, and the more the better, of general history is requisite to understanding that of the pulpit. Besides these sources of information at first hand there is a considerable literature which discusses different branches of the general subject, and is indispensable as a help to the historian. There are not a few excellent treatises and monographs which greatly reduce the necessity for research in some quarters of the field. Evidently the historian of preaching has at his disposal ample material for his work.

In fact the great abundance of the material is one of the chief difficulties in the way of writing the history of preaching. Even allowing for all the helps, and pressing the principle of selection as far as is admissible, there still remains a vast bulk of literature to go over, a deal of information to accumulate, study, digest, arrange, and finally set forth in writing. On the other hand, another difficulty arises from the lacks and gaps in the literature. Many periods and branches of the subject are still without adequate treatment, and there are very few general works to serve as basis, guide, or even warning, in the production of a really complete general history. When we add to these intrinsic difficulties of the task the exacting requisites which the modern critical and scientific spirit lays down for the writing of history,¹ we cannot

¹ See, for example, how these are set forth by Langlois and Seignobos, in their valuable *Introduction to the Study of History* (Eng. trans.).

wonder that so little has yet been accomplished in this department. It is as impossible to reach perfection in writing history as in any other human undertaking, and even to attain to excellence requires a rare combination of aptitude, learning, practice, enthusiasm, patience and leisure which might well appall the most competent.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that if difficulties of this sort were allowed their full force nobody worth attending to would have the courage to write history at all; for these obstacles are more or less incident to all historical research and writing. There is no more reason why a history of preaching should be given up as hopeless than histories of literature, of philosophy, of art, and the like.

A very slight glance at what has already been done will justify this conclusion, and at the same time lead to a consideration of what remains to be done in this too much neglected field. Foot-notes in the body of this work will give a fuller account of the literature.¹ Here only some brief statements are proposed. The literature naturally falls into the two groups of general and special works.

Of treatises bearing on the general history of preaching three sorts may be specified. First, there are those somewhat fragmentary works which may be called contributions to the history. Here, for example, belongs the old but still serviceable book of Lentz, *Geschichte der Homiletik*, published in 1839, containing brief biographical and critical notices of some of the more noted preachers of ancient, mediæval and modern times, with selections from their sermons. Somewhat like this, but with full sermons and proportionately less of biographical and critical matter is the valuable collection by H. C. Fish, *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*, published at New York in 1850, and still reprinted. Besides these are several later works, in various languages, of this general character.

¹ Paniel, *Geschichte der Christlichen Beredsamkeit*, in the introduction ably reviews the earlier literature up to 1831. Christlieb, in his two articles in Herzog-Plitt—*Geschichte der Predigt* and *Homiletik*—also has a good review of the literature to about 1886. Broadus mentions some of the best books in the appendix to his *Lectures on the History of Preaching*.

A second class of writings dealing with the whole subject are certain sketches, or compendious outlines. One of the best of these is that of J. J. Van Oosterzee in his *Practical Theology* (translation published at New York about 1879); and there are several by German authors on Homiletics, as Th. Harnack, Hering, and others; also the sketch by Professor Hoppin in his *Homiletics* is specially noteworthy, as he discusses American preachers neglected by the others. But by far the most comprehensive and thorough sketch, so complete indeed that one hesitates to call it a sketch, is the great article by Christlieb, *Geschichte der Predigt*, in the supplement to the eighteenth volume of the Herzog-Plitt *Real Encyclopædie*.¹ Even in its present form it is the nearest approach yet made to a complete though necessarily compendious history.

The remaining class of general histories of preaching are those few works which in some measure present a connected view of the whole field. In 1839 a German scholar, Paniel, published the first volume of a proposed general history of preaching under the title *Pragmatische Geschichte der Christlichen Beredsamkeit*. It was a well-planned work and showed both research and the scientific spirit, but unhappily it remains only a fragment, having got no further than Augustine in the fifth century. It is still valuable for the early centuries. Next should be mentioned the *Geschichte der Predigt von den Anfängen bis auf Schliciermacher* of Richard Rothe, edited from his manuscript remains by Trümpelmann, and published in 1881. This came nearer being a general history than any other work that had yet appeared, but it is full of gaps, much of it is mere compilation, and it lacks completeness and finish in many ways. In 1876 Dr. John A. Broadus published a small volume of *Lectures on the History of Preaching*, which had been delivered at Newton Theological Institution, near Boston. The book does not profess to cover the ground as a formal or scientific treatise, but contains some excellent work in the way of historical generalization and comment, of discussion of certain periods and men, and of

¹ At the time of this writing the new edition (ed. by Professor Hauck of Leipzig) has not reached this article.

keen and sympathetic criticism. Similar in method are the *Lectures on the History of Preaching* (1888), of Dr. John Ker of Scotland, which give a slight account of ancient and mediæval preaching, but chiefly present in a very pleasing way some of the modern German preachers. There is a spirited and readable course of lectures by the late Fleming James, D.D., *The Message and the Messengers* (1897), which is not a history, but, as the subtitle correctly describes it, a series of "lessons from the history of preaching." The most recent work is that of the late Professor T. Harwood Pattison, of Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, New York, *The History of Christian Preaching*. The work is much too brief to present adequate consideration of the great mass of material, and it does not claim to be a complete history; but it gives a series of brilliant short sketches of many of the leading preachers, with some comment on the condition of preaching in all the Christian ages.

When we come to works which treat of special epochs, countries, sects, or other departments of the history of preaching, a very much better showing can be made for the literature. There are numerous treatises of varying authorship, date, and language. Many of them have been of inestimable service in the preparation of this work, and are mentioned in the foot-notes where appropriate, so that detailed notice is not here needed.

From this brief general mention we may see that while something has been done, much remains yet to be done in this inviting field of religious history.

There is, and of course always will be, place for that class of writings called "contributions" to history, that is, accumulations of material in the way of biographical, critical, and other monographs, which will facilitate research and study, and sometimes even render them unnecessary where the historian can depend upon a careful and judicious investigator. Some of the special works spoken of in the previous paragraphs are admirable specimens of this sort of writing, but there is need for many more of the same sort.

But the most pressing present need is a general history. Such a work might take one, or indeed all, of three forms: (1) A compendious manual covering the whole

ground, but briefly and clearly; (2) A larger work of several volumes, going more into biographical, critical and general historical detail; (3) A *magnum opus* of many volumes really covering the subject and remaining a complete and enduring authority. It would be very difficult for any one scholar nowadays to produce a work of the third kind, for it would require a lifetime of leisure and plenty of means to accomplish the task, but it might be done in shorter time by the coöperation under competent editorship of a number of scholars who should devote themselves to particular epochs and countries. The books of Broadus, Ker, and especially Pattison, fall under the first head. It is the aim of the author to meet in some modest measure the second of the forementioned needs. But it will require many works of many laborers and through many years before the place of preaching in human history can be adequately set forth. To some consideration of that great sphere we may now appropriately turn.

2. THE PLACE OF PREACHING IN HISTORY

Since Christianity became an active force in human affairs there has been upward and onward movement, and one mighty factor in that progress has been preaching. There are a number of ways in which the importance of preaching in history may be shown.

The most remote point of connection should be first noted, that is, the influence of preaching upon the general course of events. The influence has necessarily been reciprocal—preaching has shaped events, and events have affected preaching. More detailed statements will make the point clearer.

The life and progress of nations, the rise and fall of governments have often been closely connected with preaching. This is no extravagant claim, as we shall have some occasion to see in the course of this work. The great names of the Apostle Paul, of John Chrysostom, of Augustine and Ambrose, of Leo and Gregory, of Boniface and Bernard, of Wiclif and Savonarola, of Luther and Calvin and Knox, of Edwards, Whitefield and Wesley, are some of those which suggest how

variously and profoundly the larger life of nations has sometimes been influenced by the preacher.

In regard to customs and morals, however, the contact of preaching with history is more visible and fruitful. Preaching has profoundly and for the most part wholesomely influenced the morals and customs of mankind. And in those few cases where the influence of the pulpit may be justly open to criticism, the injurious effects have been comparatively trivial and not permanent. On the other hand preaching has, sometimes for the better and sometimes for the worse, received moulding from contemporary customs and standards of ethics. While this sensitiveness to environment has often kept the pulpit from stagnation and given to it greater power to deal with the needs of the times, we must confess that sometimes public sentiment and entrenched evil, rather than the ostensibly accepted higher authorities, have colored the language of sermons.

Progress in the arts and sciences has contributed in many ways to preaching. Here it has received more than it has given; but its influence has not been void of good and help even in this direction; for the pulpit has many a time given intelligent aid and stimulus to material enterprises which had in view the present and permanent good of mankind. So also preaching has availed itself of the advantages of commerce to herald the gospel to other lands and peoples, and used many an improvement and device in the material sphere to make more effective its work at home.

The connection of preaching with the progress of human culture is real and extensive. Sometimes there has been conflict, sometimes mutual jealousy, but more frequently reciprocal and cordial help. Let us notice some of the particulars.

As to art it is beyond doubt that music, painting, sculpture, architecture, and even the industrial arts, have owed something to preaching, and preaching something to them. But no great amount of reciprocal influence is claimed in this sphere.

In philosophy, however, the mutual influence has been profound and profoundly important. The effect has not

always been for the best on either party, but it is safe to say that preaching has oftener been hurt by philosophy than philosophy by preaching. But there has also been wholesome and helpful interaction. Theology and ethics are fundamental in pulpit work, and their relations to philosophy are necessarily close. Names of preachers who have been eminent in philosophical work and influence are numerous; a few of the most important are Justin Martyr, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, among the ancients; Anselm, Aquinas, and others of the great schoolmen of the middle ages; Eckhart among the mystics; Calvin among the theologians of the Reformation; Edwards among American Puritans.

In regard to science there has often been full and cordial mutual recognition. Some eminent scientists have not failed in reverence for Christian institutions, the pulpit included; and some preachers here and there have been skilled scientists in various branches. But on the whole it must be sadly admitted that the relations between science and the pulpit have not been as friendly and mutually profitable as could be wished. If the progress of science has at times suffered from the dogmatism of the pulpit, even so the preaching of a sorely needed gospel has been sometimes hindered or harmed in effect by the dogmatism of science. Preachers have been known to assail science in an unchristian spirit, and scientists have perhaps as often denounced and discredited preaching in an unscientific spirit. Pulpit ignorance of science has been fairly matched by scientific ignorance of the aims and realities of the pulpit. Narrowness and arrogance on both sides have done their full share of mischief. It is time for a better understanding, for mutual respect, for more cordial united service between these two great agencies for human good. Reverent science seeking hidden truth should surely be no foe to earnest preaching proclaiming revealed truth; and the herald of God's saving grace in Christ should not be the enemy of the searcher after God's wondrous thought in creation. There is room in God's world for both the scientist and the preacher; there should be room in their hearts for each other.

In the very nature of the preacher's work lies his rela-

tion to the study and use of language. The proclamation of the gospel, the translation of the Bible, and the creation of a literature of Christian instruction in many languages of the earth have been largely the work of preachers. The impetus thus given to linguistic science has been great and fruitful. Nor must the study and employment of language for the high purposes of discourse be forgotten; not a few preachers have been masters and models of eloquence.

In the sphere of literature there has been great and hearty reciprocal service. Preaching has both directly and indirectly contributed much to literature. Yet it must be said that while many a Paul has met with his surprised and admiring Festus, it is also true that too often literature, especially fiction, has done the pulpit injustice by its one-sided presentation of the weaker or extreme types of ministerial character. But on the whole literature and the preacher have through many moons been dear lovers. Illiterate preachers have served to emphasize by contrast the learning of their more cultured brethren. Incidentally to their main work numbers of preachers have won enduring laurels in the republic of letters. Often, too, the pen of the writer and the tongue of the preacher have been allied forces in campaigns against ignorance and error.

As to education no openminded observer can fail to recognize the intimate relations between it and preaching. The debt is reciprocal and large; and it has been so all along the history of the pulpit. There has hardly ever been any really good educational movement which has failed to receive the steadfast and efficient support of the preachers as a class. In turn education has given her choicest treasures and her best discipline to the pulpit. Scientific and literary training have both served the preacher, naturally the latter more; and especially has there been necessarily close affinity between preaching and rhetorical culture. Sometimes this has been unduly neglected, and sometimes unduly magnified. Artistic, not to say artificial, oratory has not seldom been ambitiously substituted for simple and earnest proclamation of divine truth. On the other hand, the faithful presentation of the gospel has often exemplified the noblest uses

of rhetoric, and the work of the pulpit has exhibited not a few specimens of the highest oratory. Thus in many ways is the history of preaching interwoven with that of civilization and culture.

It remains to consider the largest surface of contact between preaching and history, and this, of course, is its place in the religious life and progress of mankind. Preaching is an essential part and a distinguishing feature of Christianity, and accordingly the larger history of general religious movements includes that of preaching. Here, as before, a reciprocal influence must be reckoned with: the movement has sometimes produced the preaching, the preaching sometimes the movement, but most commonly they have each helped the other. Illustrations readily occur.

The spread of Christianity, both geographically and numerically, has been largely the work of preaching. The preacher as a missionary has always been the advance herald of the gospel. From apostolic days, through the long Middle Ages, and even down to present times this has been true. Moreover, the leavening of the nations already reached by the gospel, the adding to the church daily those who are being saved, is, on the human side and to a great extent, the result of preaching. We must not underestimate the value and effect of personal example and suasion, but history forbids that we should assign an inferior place to preaching in bringing men to know Christ as Saviour and Lord, and in training them in the Christian life, doctrine and service. For spiritual life, doctrine and service are the very marrow of the gospel, and therefore of the preaching of the gospel. The message of the true preacher in every age has had to do with these fundamental things. On the other hand, Christian life as expressed and exemplified in ecclesiastical institutions, and Christian doctrine as formally stated in creeds, or even when only vaguely underlying accepted beliefs and usages, have in their turn powerfully influenced the character and aims of preaching. Alas! the story is not always a pleasing one; for doctrinal and sectarian polemics have too often been the preacher's chief concern.

Human progress of every kind is usually not steady

and continuous, but rather goes by waves, like the rising tide. Declension and revival, forward and backward, up and down, these are the common Christian phenomena, individual, local, general. Even the most superficial study reveals the connection, at once causal and resultant, between movements of the kind described and preaching. Decline of spiritual life and activity in the churches is commonly accompanied by a lifeless, formal, unfruitful preaching, and this partly as cause, partly as effect. On the other hand, the great revivals of Christian history can most usually be traced to the work of the pulpit, and in their progress they have developed and rendered possible a high order of preaching.

Again and again in the following pages we shall see illustrations of the positions taken in this discussion, and the right of preaching to a fair large room in history's many-chambered mansion may easily be vindicated and assured. So it is appropriate at this point of our introductory studies to say something as to the historic origins of preaching.

3. THE HISTORIC ORIGINS OF PREACHING

History is a study of origins and developments in human affairs. Strictly speaking the actual beginnings of most human institutions are difficult to discover, and our knowledge of them is chiefly conjectural or inferential. What we call beginnings or causes are themselves effects of previous causes and movements, and what we call effects may be the causes of subsequent events; and so the ceaseless current of time and change flows on and on. The history of any people or subject, to be complete, must begin as far back as knowledge reaches and come down to present times. But the narrative may confine itself within more or less arbitrary limits at the discretion of the historian. The scope of the present volume is to trace the history of preaching from the Apostolic Fathers at the end of the first century to and including the great Reformers of the sixteenth century. But it seems desirable to give here at least a summary sketch of the origin and development of preaching before the point at which the more detailed account begins, in order that

the reader may have before him to some extent the story from the beginnings of our knowledge.

There are three great converging lines of preparation in the way of materials, tendencies and events, which under providential guidance conspired to start, in the age immediately following the Apostles, that series of causes and effects which we are to study under the name of the history of preaching. These three elements of origination, named in the ascending order of their immediacy and importance, are the ancient oratory, the Hebrew prophecy, and the Christian gospel. From this last, as directly resting upon the second, and after a time considerably influenced by the first, came preaching as history knows it. Oratory and prophecy were preparatory and contributing forces, the gospel was the real originating cause, which took to itself elements of tendency and power from both the others.

How soon did men find and use the gift of persuasive speech? How long came oratory after language itself? There is no answer to these questions. It is likely indeed that oratory grew out of conversation, but its use and development do not tell the story of its origin. Passing by any vague theories, whether serious or humorous, of a possible derivation from the chatterings of supposititious simian ancestors, we may hazard some more plausible conjectures as to the rise and use of oratory before we discover certain traces of it in existing records. It is a natural inference that, connected with the desire and capacity of one person to influence another, language should at once have been employed for this purpose, and that from such use in conversation and dialogue it should have come to be employed by one in address to several others, from two or three to a multitude.

Spencer¹ conjectures that oratory, especially religious oratory, grew out of laudatory harangues at first addressed to heroes on returning from victorious wars, and then made in favor of deified heroes, and so of the gods. He thinks he sees traces of this custom in the acclamations of Israel at the Red Sea, and at the victory of David over Goliath, and outside of the Biblical records in some observances of the Fiji Islanders. In the same way arose

¹ *Principles of Sociology*, Vol. III., pp. 216 ff.

epic poetry, and the drama. The conjecture seems far-fetched, a pound of inference from a pennyweight of observation.

If the ethnological theory be accepted that the North American Indians represent in some respects the stage of development reached by man in the so-called Stone Age previous to recorded history, it may be plausibly claimed that the remarkable eloquence sometimes exhibited by these "untutored children of the forest" was a sample of prehistoric oratory, and gives real trace of a very remote origin of the use of persuasive speech for personal or public ends. But leaving these theories, let us come to actual history.

The three great civilizations of the ancient world—Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian—have not sent down to us any notable contribution to oratory. It is a commonplace among students of the subject that despotic governments are not favorable to eloquence, and it is probable that oratory was not much cultivated among these great peoples. Yet there are traces of its existence. The councils of war and of state, the royal audiences, petitions, pleas for justice, and the like, of which the records tell us, indicate at least some place and need for oratory as an art. In the Biblical account of Egyptian and Assyrian affairs there are a few traces of the use of public persuasive speech. The effort of Moses to be excused from going to Egypt to bring up the Israelites, on the ground of his lack of eloquence,¹ is suggestive of his acquaintance with the need of gifts in that direction in order to secure the end sought. In later times the insolent speeches of Rabshakeh, recorded in the eighteenth chapter of Second Kings, afford evidence that the art was not unknown among the Assyrians. Among the Hebrews, besides the work of the prophets to which more detailed attention will be given later, there are notices here and there of an oratory not especially or at all religious. The speech of Lamech² to his wives Adah and Zillah has been adduced as a specimen of antediluvian oratory, but it more properly belongs to poetry. Professor Sears³ pertinently inquires as to what kind of oratory the author of the Book of Job must have heard in order to produce such

¹ Exod. 4: 10 ff. ² Gen. 4: 23. ³ *History of Oratory*, p. 28.

speeches as those uttered by the interlocutors in that drama. The pathetic and simply beautiful speech of Judah¹ before Joseph in Egypt is justly admired as a choice specimen of unpretentious eloquence. In the ninth chapter of the Book of Judges we have an interesting speech from Jotham,² who compared the selection of his murderous half-brother, Abimelech, to be ruler or "king" over a part of Israel, to the choice of the bramble as king by the trees of the forest. Besides, there are a few other traces of a secular, or at least not distinctively religious, oratory in the Old Testament. But on the whole the oratory of the ancient peoples before the Grecian and Roman times was not abundant in quantity nor of the highest quality. Its value as literature and its significance in history alike are slight.

A widely different state of affairs greets us when we come to study the oratory of the Greeks. Both the literary value and the historic importance of their orations are of the highest sort. Ancient eloquence, on its secular and artistic side, reached its culmination among this gifted and versatile people. The speeches in the Homeric Poems show that in the earliest, semi-mythical times the Greeks employed and prized the gift of eloquence. The growth of political freedom, the early and vigorous development of dialectic philosophy, the cultivation and excellence of art and literature, along with the imaginative and lively intellect and the flexible and powerful language of the Greeks, all contributed to their marvellous and abiding attainments in the field of oratory.³ It was cultivated in all the Greek countries, but reached its highest stage of development at Athens, and its personal acme in Demosthenes. Along with the practice of public speaking came the theory, the reduction to principles and rules, the teaching of rhetoric as an art. It is a notable coincidence that Demosthenes, the greatest orator of ancient times, and Aristotle, the great philosopher, and author of the most original and suggestive treatise on rhetoric in ancient literature, should have lived at the same time and died the same year, 322, B.C. With the passing away of

¹ Gen. 44: 18.

² See Broadus, *History of Preaching*, p. 8.

³ See Grote's *History of Greece*, chaps. 46 and 67; Jebb's *Attic Orators*, introd.; Sears' *History of Oratory*, chaps. II.-V.

these masters, and the political overthrow of ancient Greece, the oratory of the Greeks rapidly degenerated. But its lasting impress had been left on the history of oratory, and of civilization.

The Latin oratory was not of so excellent quality nor of so long duration as the Greek. Here too theory and practice developed together, but with the difference that the Romans had both the advantage and the disadvantage of possessing the Greek models. In the early days of the Republic, though there was some Greek influence, the Roman oratory was more independent and original, and was giving promise of a development and power of its own. But after the conquest of Greece the influence of the better Greek ideas and achievements in this as in other lines of literature was irresistible, and Latin oratory is, for the comparatively brief period of its development, mostly imitation or adaptation of the Greek.

The chief representative of Roman oratory is Cicero, who died B.C. 43. But there were a number of others too, and these gave a peculiar Roman stamp to their oratory. The Latin mind was much too vigorous not to be something of a Samson even in the chains of its enthrallment to Greek models. The best Latin treatise on rhetoric, that of Quintilian, was published probably in the latter part of the first Christian century, or the early part of the second. It is one of the very best works of all time on that subject, and has been a storehouse for all subsequent writers on rhetoric. In literary finish, in proportionate treatment of subjects, in fulness of material and completeness of range it excels the more original, suggestive and profound work of Aristotle.

Among both Greeks and Romans there was ample provision for instruction in the art of oratory.¹ In fact this was the chief element of ancient education. So we find that at the coming of Christianity rhetorical treatises, teachers and schools abounded, many speeches of the

¹Information is obtainable from the works of Grote and Jebb, previously named; and from Davidson's *Aristotle and the Ancient Educational Ideals*, Hatch's Hibbert Lectures for 1888 on *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, and from a very entertaining and instructive article by M. Gaston Boissier in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for March 15, 1884 (Vol. LXII), p. 316 ff. on *Instruction Publique dans l'Empire Romain*.

greatest Greek and Roman orators were preserved and potent in the culture of the age, and these two languages were dominant in all the social life of the peoples, among whom the new religion was to make its principal advances for centuries to come.

The Græco-Roman oratory at its best estate was lacking in one great essential to the highest eloquence. It had no religious content, and but incidentally a moral one. The accepted division of oratory into its kinds was threefold: deliberative, or political; forensic, or judicial; and epideictic, or declamatory. The first two are easily enough understood, the last is not so clear. At first it was meant to embrace funeral or memorial orations, or panegyrical discourses upon living persons, or patriotic speeches, or, as Aristotle defines it, was concerned chiefly with praise and blame. But in this classification of orations there is notable omission of the didactic element. There was nothing in ancient oratory corresponding to our lecture platform or pulpit. Lectures by teachers were hardly considered as belonging to oratory at all, and their declamations given as models to their pupils would probably have been classed under the third division, if anywhere. Of course, moral teaching could, and to some extent actually did, find place in all three kinds of speeches, but it was incidental to their main purpose in each case. A fourth kind of oratory, not that of the deliberative political assembly, not that of the law courts, not that of the memorial or panegyrical occasion, but that which as its main purpose should convey instruction with a view to ethical and religious culture and activity, was wanted before the trained gift of eloquence could find its noblest content and its best use. We are now to see how this lack was supplied. When Roman imperialism had conspired with other causes to ruin deliberative eloquence and depress the other two, Christian preaching gradually arose to devote oratory to a new service and fill it with a grander message. But before we reach the historical confluence of ancient oratory with distinctively Christian eloquence we must trace the separate line of development along which in the order of divine Providence gospel preaching arose.

In the ancient Hebrew prophecy we have exactly the

counterpart, in respect of moral and religious content and aim, to the Græco-Roman oratory. Of distinctively political, judicial, or declamatory speaking the Israelites probably had little or none, but their prophets were an order of orators charged with divine messages and devoted to the moral and spiritual culture of the people. We must beware of thinking exclusively of the predictive element in the work of Israel's prophets.¹ "It was by no means the main business of the prophets to predict the future, as people are now apt to suppose from our modern use of the word prophet, but they spoke of the past and the present, often much more than of the future. The prophets reminded the people of their sins, exhorted them to repent, and instructed them in religious and moral, in social and personal duties; and when they predicted the future it was almost always in the way of warning or encouragement, as a motive to forsake their sins and serve God. . . . The prophets were preachers." These words of Dr. Broadus state the case clearly and well.

In the earliest ages it is said that "Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied."² And Noah is called "a preacher of righteousness."³ Thus accepted Hebrew tradition recognized the beginnings of distinctively religious oratory in the most remote patriarchal times. The blessings of Isaac⁴ and of Jacob⁵ are examples of formal and solemn religious address in the poetical style. The book of Deuteronomy is a series of addresses repeating and expanding and enforcing in this form much of the legislation of Moses. Later as a sort of supplement we have the two farewell discourses of Joshua,⁶ filled with earnest and wholesome counsel and appeal.⁷

From the time of Samuel (B.C. 1050) to that of Jeremiah (B.C. 629), was the great prophetic period in Israel's history. Within this time appeared Samuel, Nathan, Gad, Azariah, Elijah, Elisha, Joel, Micah,

¹ See Broadus, *History of Preaching*, pp. 10-18.

² Jude 14. ³ 2 Peter 2:5. ⁴ Gen. 27:27-29.

⁵ Gen. 49:3-27. ⁶ Josh, chaps. 23 and 24.

⁷ The poetical prophecies of the singularly gifted Oriental seer Balaam, and the lofty discourses in the drama of Job are beside the direct line of Hebrew prophecy in the proper sense.

Micaiah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and others.¹ These men of God came to people and kings with their certified divine messages, often introducing their great addresses with the formula, "Thus saith the Lord." They pleaded, warned, rebuked, encouraged; they crushed with sovereign threatenings and judgments; they built up with glowing divine promises of unspeakable and enduring glory to come. By no means are all the incidents of their careers related, nor is more than a fraction of their addresses preserved, but judging from what is known of their lives and works we surely gather vivid impressions of the greatness of their characters, the strength of their influence, and the lasting value of their discourses.

The last period of Hebrew prophecy extended from Ezekiel and Daniel to Malachi, from the exile to the restoration and later. In this period of the Jewish national life the character and influence of prophecy did not materially change. It was still the voice of God through chosen men to his chosen people. In form and content it still ministered to the religious life and aims of the people, both by preaching to the present and pointing to the future. But for long years the voice of prophecy was mute, awaiting the coming of the Promised One, the dawn of a new era.

During this period the worship of the Jews had a very important development, and one specially significant in the history of preaching. This was the hortatory exposition of the Sacred Writings in connection with the services of the synagogue. While the actual origin of the synagogue has not been definitely fixed, the growth of the institution into an established feature of Jewish religious life occurs during the time now under review. In the eighth chapter of Nehemiah there is record of the great occasion, soon after the return from the exile, when "Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose," and others assisted him, and

¹ For a good treatment of the homiletical value of the preaching of the prophets see Stalker's *The Preacher and His Models*. The matter finds instructive comment in Ker's *Lectures on the History of Preaching*, and in James' *Message and the Messengers*. For a discussion from the point of view of the modern critical school see George Adam Smith's *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*.

"they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused [the people] to understand the reading." Philo¹ gives testimony to the effect that at the time of the introduction of Christianity the services of the synagogue, "consisted chiefly of oral instruction and of free extended speaking." We find both our Lord and the Apostles availing themselves of this custom to proclaim the gospel. Thus we see that there was a clearly defined basis for Christian preaching in the sacred speech of that people from whom in the divine ordering of events Christianity sprang. And so in the widely separated lines of development which the sacred and the secular oratory of the ancient world pursued before the coming of our Lord, God was laying the foundation for the use of public speech as a means in the spread and the establishment of Christianity. Prophecy was preparation only. The proclaiming of the gospel of the kingdom of God was the actual initial step in the historic progress of Christian preaching. In this proclamation there are three distinct but successive, and therefore not wholly separate stages, namely, the preaching of John the Baptist, of our Lord himself, and of the Apostles and their fellow-workers.

John was the connecting link between the Old Testament and the New, the last and greatest of the prophets, the first preacher of the new dispensation. The character of the man was marked by great originality (though he was much like Elijah) and power. He was brusque, bold, candid, ready; but modest, devoted and faithful. The great fact that he announced was the immediate coming of the promised reign of God, "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." The promised Messiah was now about to arrive, and he himself was but a voice preparing the way of the Lord. In the greater work and glory of the Coming One he must be lost to view. Along with announcing this fact he had a great duty to enjoin, that of immediate preparation for the kingdom by a sincere

¹Quoted by Hoppin, *Homiletics*, p. 23. On the relation of synagogue worship to preaching see Maybaum, *Jüdische Homiletik*, Einleitung. This writer, however, makes the mistake of leaving out of his definition of preaching the prophetic element and confining it to the exposition of Scripture. Something also may be found on the subject in Scherer's (Eng. trans.) *Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, Vol. II., p. 54.

and fruitful repentance. This he enforced by many an apt illustration and example, many a strong and brave application. His work was fortified and his message of repentance strikingly symbolized in the rite of baptism from which he gets his name.¹ It had not been uncommon for the older prophets to employ external things as signs, tokens, illustrations of their messages. John does not seem to have used the synagogues, but to have preached altogether to the crowds in the open air. In both character and work he has received the highest possible endorsement in the encomium of his Lord, "Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist."

In the work of Jesus himself, however, lies the main foundation of Christian preaching for all time.² It is not within the plan of this volume to give a thorough study of our Lord as a preacher. The theme demands a book to itself.³ The purpose here is merely to indicate the salient features of Christ's preaching as the basis of subsequent historic development.

In comparing our Lord's preaching with that of John we notice that its burden was the same, but with a difference. Matthew tells us,⁴ "From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." But as we go on to study the contents of his teaching from the beginning to the close of his ministry we observe more and more that the burden of his message is himself. He proclaims himself as the fulfillment of prophecy, as the Son, and therefore, the revealer of God, and cautiously at first, but with increasing distinctness, as the king of a spiritual realm, and finally throughout his ministry as the Saviour and Deliverer of men, the Way to God, the Good Shepherd who giveth his life for

¹ Cf. Broadus, *History of Preaching*, pp. 19-21.

² For the preaching of our Lord see Broadus, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-36, also his *Lectures on Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 43 ff.; Pattison's *History of Christian Preaching*, p. 14 ff; Stalker's *Imago Christi*, chaps. XII.-XV.; Armitage's *Lectures on Preaching*, Lects. I., II. Of course the subject is touched in most of the numerous works on the Life of Christ.

³ Such a book has recently appeared in the *Jesus und seine Predigt* of Erich von Schrenck. But his treatment is rather exegetical and theological than homiletical. ⁴ Matt. 4: 17.

the sheep, the Redeemer who would give his life as a ransom for many. He is his own gospel.

Accordingly the duty which he enjoins is not distinctively repentance (though this is understood) as preparation for a coming Lord, but rather faith in the Lord who has now come. He offers himself and his work to the acceptance of his hearers. He is the revelation and embodiment of God's gracious ways with men, and as such he is to be received and trusted. His message is, "Come unto me . . . and I will give you rest."¹ "Believe in God, and believe in me."² "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."³

The occasions and audiences of his preaching varied greatly. He sometimes conversed with individuals, announcing the great truths and distinctive principles of his gospel. Sometimes he talked with small groups, and sometimes he preached to great multitudes. Now we see him in the synagogue on the Sabbath day using the opportunity of worship for the proclamation of his message, and again we find him by sea or on mountain declaring the principles of his kingdom to those whom his teaching or his miracles had attracted.

The character of his preaching was a wonderful union of power and of charm. Its dominant note was authority, supreme confidence in God, in himself, in his mission and message. He ranged from scathing invective to tender invitation; he employed argument, aphoristic saying, parable, exposition of Scripture, with wonderful skill and effect; he mingled with all a yearning for men's good and God's honor which abides the ideal motive for all worthy preaching.

During his ministry our Lord twice⁴ sent out bands of his disciples, two and two, to proclaim his kingdom. He gave them both their message and practical instructions for their guidance. It is not impossible that he did more of this work than these two recorded instances. After the Ascension we find the Apostles and others waiting at Jerusalem for the promised enduement of the Holy Spirit. In the book of Acts and in the Epistles we have traces of the Apostles' preaching after Pentecost had

¹ Matt. 11:28.

² John 14:1.

³ John 6:47; *et sim.*

⁴ Matt. chap. 10; Luke chap. 10.

given them their mission. Adequate treatment of this topic also does not fall within the scope of this treatise, but as the transition from the personal ministry of Jesus to the later history, the preaching of the Apostles and their colaborers claims at least a brief consideration.¹

The apostolic preaching was accompanied by more immediate and consciously felt manifestation and direction of the Holy Spirit than was the case with later preaching. Along with this there were certain supernatural gifts which seem to have been granted for the attestation of the apostolic ministry, and to have continued with declining frequency and clearness a little way into the post-apostolic age. Such were the gifts of tongues, healings, miracles.

The content of the preaching was fundamentally the same as that of the Lord, with only the important difference made by the great facts of his crucifixion, resurrection and ascension, and the great promise of his second coming. Christ himself was still the central and dominant theme of the gospel message. Both repentance and faith, the union of John's burden with that of his Master, found due emphasis in the apostolic preaching. It proclaims a crucified, risen, reigning and coming Saviour and Lord. It is universal in time, having touch with past, present and future; in extent, reaching out to all men of every race and class in the world; and in character, holding the one remedy for all sin, the one way of reconciliation with God, the one path to eternal life.

In regard to method we see in the reported discourses of the Acts, and inferentially in the style and contents of the Epistles,² that the Apostles were greatly influenced by the ancient prophets in their general mode of address.

¹ Cf. the works previously mentioned of Broadus, Pattison, Stalker and Armitage. James does not treat the matter at length. The numerous modern works on the church of the apostolic age pay some attention to the preaching of the times. See, for example, Lightfoot's notes to his commentaries on Galatians and Philippians; Hort's *Ecclesia*; Lindsay's *Church and Ministry in the Early Centuries*; Allen's *Christian Institutions*; articles in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, and many others. In most works of this nature some caution is requisite in the reading, because of the tendency toward the over-use of inference and conjecture, from confessedly scanty materials, to establish critical or ecclesiastical theories. ² Cf. Broadus, *History of Preaching*, p. 36 ff.

Unless Paul's discourse at Athens¹ be an exception, we can detect little if any trace of influence from the ancient classical oratory. The two permanent elements of Christian preaching appear: evangelism and instruction. There is free speaking to men anywhere and everywhere in announcement of the gospel and in urgency of its claims, and there is orderly and authorized public instruction and edification of believers in their assemblies for worship, based upon the ancient Scriptures and the gospel tradition now becoming Scripture. For these ends there are apostles and prophets, elders, pastors and teachers, and evangelists. Thus in all essential respects we find in the apostolic preaching the regulative basis for Christian preaching in all times. The preaching of John was transitional, that of Jesus was unique, that of the Apostles and their fellow workers is our abiding model.

We are ready now to begin to trace the history of preaching from its origins. In the ancient classical oratory we have the artistic and effective use of language, as an instrument for the proclamation and enforcement of truth, brought to its highest degree of power. In the fervid moral and religious addresses of the Old Testament prophets we see exemplified the best possible employment to which oratory can be put. In the Christian gospel as proclaimed by Jesus and his appointed spokesmen we perceive the greatest and best content with which oratory can be charged for all time. On these historic foundations the fabric of preaching has been reared through the Christian centuries. We must give attention to its outlines.

4. OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF PREACHING

History cannot be forced into arbitrary divisions, for at the borders there is always overlapping. The history of any age is dependent upon the preceding, and contributory to the subsequent ages; the history of any people touches that of other peoples; and the history of any subject is related to that of kindred subjects. Yet there is manifest propriety, not to say necessity, in having divisions of all the sorts indicated. Also the marking of

¹ Acts 17:22-31.

periods in the history of any people or subject is at once a convenience of study and a requirement of the subject-matter; but we must always remember that these boundaries are only approximate, never exact. It is true that in the course of events there are different facts and phases of life to be dealt with, and certain decisive occurrences or strongly marked changes emphasize their dates as turning points. But while some dates are practically accepted by all historians as suitable turning points, it is evident that particular considerations of people, place, subject, and the like, give rise to unavoidable differences in locating the exact time for recording the change or event. Thus while the division of general history into ancient, mediæval and modern is generally accepted, the particular dates of the transitions are by no means unanimously agreed upon; and for particular countries and subjects there must of necessity be different periods. The epochs of English history, for example, do not coincide with those of German or French history, nor the dates of the history of philosophy with those of the history of art, of literature, or of preaching; though at some points there is interesting connection because of some general event or mode of thought influencing all, or because of special relations at various times. Again, the assignment of periods must be largely the prerogative of each historian, according to his conception of his subject-matter, or his practical aim in writing, or other subjective considerations. In surveying the history of preaching as a whole we shall find that its course corresponds, as we should naturally expect, in marked degree with that of both general and ecclesiastical history; we shall note longer and shorter seasons of varying character, prosperity and power; and we shall be able to assign with at least approximate accuracy the dates which may be best assumed as turning points.

After the death of the Apostles and their fellow workers there is a time of decline, until gradually preaching rises in power to its ancient culmination in the fourth and early fifth century. Then it falls into a long night of obscurity and weakness, till with the preaching of the Crusades and the rise of Scholasticism it begins to revive, and reaches the height of its mediæval power in the thir-

teenth century. Then again there is a general and fearful falling off in purity and power; but the Reformation comes as another high wave gathering force slowly to its crest in the early part of the sixteenth century. After that, the unity of Christendom being forever broken, and other things coöperating, the modern period exhibits so great diversities in the character of preaching in different lands that it is not so easy to describe preaching in general terms. For while it flourishes in one country, it is often depressed in another, and while exhibiting one character in one sect or people, it may have another in others. Thus during the ascendancy of Puritan doctrinal preaching in England there was the culmination of Catholic oratorical preaching in France; and the progress of the Wesleyan revival in England was contemporary with the dry-rot of rationalism in Germany. Yet in a general way, allowing for exceptions of all sorts, it is not inaccurate to describe the period next after the Reformation as one of decline, wherein doctrinal controversies too much occupied the pulpit; and while this was especially true of Germany it also found illustration elsewhere. The later modern period, chiefly in the nineteenth century, is undoubtedly the greatest in the history of the Christian pulpit, leaving out, of course, the originating period which is not included in our scheme, and for many reasons is unique and not to be compared with any subsequent one. Both the revival and the missionary impulses which have characterized this last period entitle it preëminently to be called the evangelical age. Its close is placed at the end of the nineteenth century only for convenience, for the obvious reason that even if we contemporaries seem to recognize the beginnings of a new epoch in preaching about this time, we cannot foresee its general character and course with sufficient distinctness to give it limits and a name. But waiving the matter of dates and boundaries as impossible, and looking only at the great tendencies in the religious life of our times, we should not perhaps guess very far amiss if we predict that later historians may have to describe the period of preaching on which we have just entered as the humanitarian or social age.

Bearing in mind the explanations made, we may assume

six fairly well defined periods for the general history of preaching, as follows :

Period I. A.D. 70-430.—The Ancient, or Patristic, Age. From the times of the Apostolic Fathers to the close of the labors of Chrysostom (d. 407) and of Augustine (d. 430).

Period II. 430-1095.—The Early Mediæval, or Dark, Age. After the times of Chrysostom and Augustine up to the preaching of the first Crusade, by Peter the Hermit and Pope Urban II.

Period III. 1095-1361.—The Central Mediæval, or Scholastic, Age. From the times of Peter the Hermit and Urban II. to the close of Tauler's (d. 1361) and the beginning of Wiclif's (ordained 1361) ministry.

Period IV. 1361-1572.—The Transitional, or Reformatory, Age. From the times of Tauler and Wiclif to the death of John Knox, the last of the great Reformers.

Period V. 1572-1738.—The Early Modern, or Dogmatic, Age. After the times of the great Reformers up to the beginning of the English revival under Whitefield and Wesley.

Period VI. 1738-1900.—The later Modern, or Evangelical, Age. From the times of Whitefield and Wesley to the end of the nineteenth century.

In the present volume it is proposed to treat of only the first four of these periods, tracing the general history of preaching down to the close of the work of the great Reformers. Of these Zwingli died in 1531, Luther in 1546, Calvin in 1564, and Knox in 1572. While the work of the Reformation went on in its effects and struggles beyond this time, the preaching of the Reformation reached its culmination in these men and their contemporaries.

PERIOD I

THE ANCIENT, OR PATRISTIC, AGE

A.D. 70-430

**From the times of the Apostolic Fathers to the death of Chrysostom
(407) and of Augustine (430)**

CHAPTER I.

PREACHING DURING THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

In the introduction some attention has been paid to the origin of preaching in the work of Christ and his Apostles. We begin here to trace its development and progress from this beginning on through the ages down to the close of the work of the great Reformers in the sixteenth century. The first general period laid out for our study extends from the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 to the death of the great theologian, bishop and preacher, Augustine, in 430. In this chapter only so much of that period as covers the first three centuries will be brought under review.

I. GENERAL VIEW OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

The fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 marks the end of the Jewish commonwealth, and is in many ways a significant and impressive event in general and church history. It also has a particular bearing on the history of preaching, and in time nearly coincides with the death of the apostles Peter and Paul, who probably suffered under Nero in 68.

At the end of the third and early in the fourth century Christianity was strong enough to withstand the last

furious persecution (under Diocletian), and induce Constantine to change the attitude of the imperial government from contempt and opposition to tolerance and patronage. Within these centuries there were many events and forces which had great influence in determining the character and shaping the future of Christianity as an institution, and likewise profoundly affected the development of preaching. And so for a proper understanding of the course of preaching it is fitting that we first give at least a hurried glance at the general state of the Empire and of Christianity during these centuries.

Titus, the conqueror of Jerusalem, fell heir to an empire which, extending from Rome and Italy as a centre, reached westward and included Spain and Portugal; northwestward it took in France, the Netherlands and England; northward it held the German debatable territories on both sides of the Rhine; northeastward it claimed sovereignty to the Danube, and sometimes beyond, but could not always make good its claims in this direction; eastward it took in Dalmatia, Thrace, Greece, Asia Minor, and Armenia; southeastward it held the ancient lands of Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and far in to where Parthian and Persian disputed its eager lust of power by the Euphrates and Tigris; southward it embraced the territories of its ancient rival Carthage, and the provinces of Northern Africa stretching westward to the ocean, where at the Straits of Gibraltar the circuit is completed.

The varied character of the population of this mighty empire is, of course, evident at a glance, nor was it possible for even so powerful a government as that of Rome to weld these varied nations into a homogeneous people. Yet, with many minute variations, the Græco-Roman type of civilization was generally prevalent; and the use of both the Greek and Latin languages was widely spread. In the East the extension of Greek ideas and the conquest of Alexander had prepared the way for the predominance and perpetuation of the Hellenic elements of the dual culture; while in the West the Latinizing of North Africa, Spain and Gaul, partly begun under republican and early achieved under imperial rule, emphasized the Roman elements. The Eastern Empire was essen-

tially Greek with infusion of Latin and Oriental ingredients; the Western Empire was essentially Roman with infusion of Hellenic and barbarian ingredients. The failure of Rome to conquer and assimilate the Germanic peoples as it had done the Iberian and Keltic races left an open door for barbarian conquest, and hastened, soon after the permanent division, the downfall of the Western Empire. The surging and mingling of races, with all accompanying forces of discord and corruption, were fairly under way in Vespasian's time, and went on with marked results throughout our period.

Building on the foundations of the older Roman rule, the wonderful political genius of Cæsar and of Augustus had constructed a fabric which stood the shock of the tyrannies and crimes of their degenerate followers till Vespasian retrieved the fallen glories of imperial rule, and his successors—except Domitian, and until Commodus—governed with great ability. Confusion followed, but Diocletian at the end of the third century again made imperial rule strong and respected. But we should go far astray if we regarded the imperial court and headquarters alone in our study of Roman government. The provinces and cities of the empire were also fields for the display of that marvellous administrative faculty which distinguished the Roman people. It was their settled policy not to interfere with local and popular institutions any further than was necessary to the maintenance of their military supremacy and the management of the imperial revenues. But these items necessarily involved the enactment of many laws and the general administration of justice. And thus in various ways, throughout this vast extent of lands and among peoples so diverse, the complicated system of Roman government held for ages its mighty sway over the most active and progressive races of mankind.

The imperial succession, and the characters and doings of the emperors during this period were all forces of importance in shaping events. The confusion after the wicked and tyrannical Nero was ended by the accession of the able general and ruler Vespasian, whose son Titus, the conqueror of Jerusalem, followed in a short though promising reign, to be himself followed for fifteen years

by the mad tyrant Domitian. Then followed the "five good emperors"—Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius—whose mostly beneficent reigns filled out not quite a century (96-180). After the good emperors came, through a little more than a century (180-306), a long succession of short reigns. From Commodus to Constantine were more than thirty emperors. Many of them were bad, some unfortunate, a few were able rulers. Diocletian associated others with himself, divided the empire, and thus paved the way for discord and civil wars. Meantime we are more concerned with the rise and growth of another power destined to play even a greater part than Rome in the history of the world, and that is Christianity.

Already in Paul's lifetime that apostle could write¹ of the gospel as being "in all the world bearing fruit and increasing;" his own extensive labors are familiarly known, and it is reasonable to suppose that even at the commencement of our period the gospel had at least been made known in all parts of the empire. Soon it had reached even beyond those bounds, and by the end of the time we have in view it had adherents in all the world. "From Britain to India the name of Christ was honored."² How numerous these adherents were at any given time it is of course impossible to say. They were certainly a minority of the population, but yet a very strong minority, even at the time of Diocletian's persecution.

As Christianity was not a legalized religion till Constantine, the imperial policy before that time wavered between toleration and persecution, and this lack of a settled attitude is illustrated among both the bad and the good emperors. Thus Nero, Domitian and Maximin were persecutors, but so were Marcus Aurelius and Diocletian. Trajan and Hadrian were tolerant, but so was Caracalla. It was largely as popular feeling or the whim of the emperor pleased.

Not only in the outward relations of Christianity, but also in its inner development there were noteworthy events and forces. The simple polity and worship of the

¹ Col. 1: 5, 6.

² A. H. Newman, *Manual of Church History*, Vol. I., p. 291.

apostolic churches soon began to develop toward a more complicated organization and a more elaborate ritual. The pastors came to be distinguished as bishops and presbyters, and the deacons were made an order of ministry. A powerful stimulus was given toward the developments of later times. Centering about the observance of the Lord's Supper, and commemorating sacred seasons, worship became at once enriched and corrupted by ceremonial accretions, and grew into an imposing ritual.

Nothing in the history of the first three centuries of Christianity is more notable than the defence and gradual formulation of Christian doctrine. Already in apostolic times the Gnostic heresies were beginning to appear. Others followed, and the teachings of the gospel had to be guarded from corrupt forms of professedly Christian faith. Opposition from without called forth the Apologists with their statements, and the natural tendency of study and speculation developed the theologians of various schools.

2. PARTICULAR RELATION OF SOME EVENTS TO PREACHING.

We shall have frequent occasion to observe that preaching, like all other special institutions, is responsive to general influences; and so it shared, more or less directly, in the whole character and movement of the age as briefly outlined in the preceding section. But besides this general influence of the times there are several matters of great importance which had a more particular influence in shaping the development and character of preaching. These were, the dispersion and final overthrow of the Jews as a nation, the great extension of the Roman empire, and the imperial persecutions of the Christians.

From the time of the Captivity under the Assyrian and Babylonian kings the Israelites had begun to be scattered among the nations of the earth, and this movement was accelerated during the time we are now studying by the great events which then occurred. Already during the labors of the Apostles there were Jewish communities and synagogues in the chief cities which they visited;

and these influenced preaching partly by the opportunity they offered and the mode they suggested for the proclamation of the gospel, and partly also by the stimulus of opposition and rejection which turned the Apostles and early preachers more and more to the Gentiles.

In A. D. 70 the long and dreadful siege of Jerusalem by the Roman armies ended in the capture and destruction of the city. The horrors of that awful event are equaled in impressiveness only by its momentous lessons. Israel had failed to meet the splendid opportunities of the divine election. It now passes as a nation from the historic page, leaving written behind it the warning moral of its checkered story. The overthrow of the Holy City and the destruction of the Temple published in tremendous tones what the rejection and crucifixion of Jesus had already made a settled thing, namely, the end of the Jewish and the inauguration of the Christian dispensation, as the special channel of God's revelation to men. The first Christians were mostly Jews. After the overthrow of Jerusalem they had no more a Jewish commonwealth to live for—they were citizens of the kingdom of heaven. The effect of this change of view in their religious relations had its effect on the preaching of the sub-apostolic age. Prophecy was fulfilled, and a new and impressive message must go with the proclamation of the gospel to all the world. The failure of all attempts to re-establish the Jewish nation only marked finality upon what had been so impressively taught by the fall of Jerusalem.

Let it be noted just here that the widest extent of the Roman Empire was reached in this age, under the Emperor Trajan (A. D. 98-117); but both before and after this time the vast and varied empire under one strong government was a mighty force in the progress of civilization, and thus lent its aid to the development of Christian preaching. The wide extent of Roman influence, the great roads and lines of communication, the prevalence of the Greek and Latin languages, were all factors of no small importance in that development.

We must now say a word as to the imperial persecutions. Up to the beginning of the fourth century Christianity was an unlawful religion in the Roman Empire. As such it was the object of popular hatred, and received

much social persecution. Sometimes also the government was aroused to violent action against the Christians. These imperial persecutions were rather spasmodic in character, but some of them were very severe while they lasted. Some were local and some more extensive. The worst of them were those under Marcus Aurelius (165), Decius (250), Valerian (258), and Diocletian (303). They did not suppress Christianity, but made Christians more earnest and determined. This deep earnestness no doubt made itself felt in the preaching of the period. Another way in which the persecutions affected preaching was more external. They hindered, though they could not prevent, the gathering of large assemblies; and they interfered with and retarded the building of churches. Thus the preaching in large measure lacked these aids to oratorical development, and as a matter of fact it remained rather informal and personal in character throughout this early epoch. Other causes contributed to this, but it is not unlikely that the persecutions had something to do with it.

3. THE INNER DEVELOPMENT OF PREACHING.

More important, however, for us is the inner development of preaching during the second and third centuries. It is an obscure period, and we therefore cannot trace the development with as much accuracy and clearness as is desirable; but there are not wanting some valuable hints and data whereby a tolerably distinct view of the preaching of the age may be presented. That there was great decline in the power of preaching after the death of the Apostles and on to the times of Hippolytus, Origen and Cyprian in the latter part of the second and early part of the third century seems quite certain. For about a hundred years after the death of Peter and Paul (say from 70-170) the traces of preaching are extremely scanty, and do not exhibit any great degree of power. The very meagreness of our information, while it prevents our forming a safe judgment, is in itself an indication of weakness. For had there been a very powerful preaching in this era it is hardly conceivable that it would not have left more evidence of itself both in tradition and

in literature. But toward the end of the second century, with the work of Clement and Origen at Alexandria, and of Irenaeus and Hippolytus in the West there is clear evidence of increased power in the ministry of the word. And this rise of strength prepared the way for the greater oratorical triumphs of the fourth century. But taking in the whole period of about two hundred and thirty years from the close of the apostolic age to the beginning of the fourth century, we may group the characteristics of preaching about the following points: (1) the preacher and his audience, (2) the contents of the preaching, (3) the form of the discourse, and (4) the preservation of sermons.

The essential personal factors in all speaking—the speaker and hearer—are necessarily to be considered in preaching, and their contribution to the character of the discourse must be duly estimated. Was preaching in this early time confined to an official class, or was it regarded as the privilege and duty of every believing man? It is probable that the regular church preaching, the exhortation or teaching addressed to the congregations of believers, was at first quite free, and was done by those who would volunteer for the service. At the same time it appears that even in apostolic times there was, parallel with this freedom and voluntariness, distinct recognition of “teachers”¹ and of “evangelists” also, in addition to the “apostles” and the “prophets,” all of whom were in some sense especially charged with the duty of preaching. In regard to heralding, or evangelistic preaching, this would naturally vary from the conversational appeal and teaching, addressed to one or a few, up to the more extended and formal discourse addressed to a crowd or to some orderly assemblage. All this, no doubt, was guided by circumstances—in the nature of things preaching cannot be reduced to one type at any time. But it was natural that along with the developments in church organization, and the tendency toward increasing officialism therein displayed, there should also be a growing tendency to confine the work of preaching to an official class of duly authorized men. It appears² that very soon after

¹ 1 Cor. 12:28 and Eph. 4:11, 12.

² Paniel's *Geschichte der Christlichen Beredsamkeit*, S. 73 ff.; Rothe's *Geschichte der Predigt*, S. 8.

apostolic times preaching in the Christian assemblies was confined to the presbyters and bishops. Evangelistic preaching (which was more informal), and personal dealing with individuals (or smaller groups than assemblies) were not sharply distinguished and were recognized as the duty of all; but the exigencies of orderly worship and correct teaching required the appointment and qualification of a special class. How far apostolic initiative and sanction were followed in this matter does not clearly appear, but the qualifications required of the bishops in the third chapter of First Timothy, as well as some other indications, show that apostolic authority was not wholly lacking. The *Didache*¹ mentions travelling "apostles" and "prophets," as well as settled "teachers," who must be supported; and also notices that the "teachers" at least were elected by the churches.

In the latter part of our period it is clear that the regular church preaching has now come to be generally recognized as the duty of a special class. Others than presbyters could not formally preach in the churches without especial permission of the bishop, and it seems that the privilege was not granted to the presbyters themselves when a bishop was present without the request or sanction of the higher officer. The case of Origen, though peculiar, illustrates the point; at first he was permitted and encouraged to expound the Scriptures at Alexandria, but on his being ordained a presbyter at Cæsarea in later years his bishop, Demetrius of Alexandria, urgently objected.² In the less formal evangelistic preaching there does not seem to have been any rigid custom or rule. For Justin Martyr was never ordained a presbyter, but he doubtless preached much.

In regard to the details of posture and delivery the preacher usually sat, and spoke freely.³ Eusebius⁴ quotes Irenaeus as saying that he remembered "the very place where the blessed Polycarp was accustomed to sit

¹ See chaps. 11, 12, 13, 15. For travelling preachers of a later time see Eusebius, *H. E.*, III., 27. Cf. Lindsay, *The Church and Ministry of the Early Centuries*, chap. III.

² Euseb., *H. E.*, VI., 8, 23.

³ This was in accord with Hebrew custom (Matt. 5:1; Luke 4:20), but the Greek orators stood. ⁴ *H. E.*, V., 20.

and discourse." But while the extemporaneous delivery was the rule there is indication in at least one striking relic of the early times—the Ancient Homily—that the preacher sometimes read his discourse to the worshipping assembly. Broadus remarks,¹ "The apostolical Epistles were not in general expected to be read by all or by many of those to whom they were sent, but were written addresses designed to be read² out in meeting and listened to." Early Christian teachers, as Clement, Irenæus and others, followed the apostolic custom and wrote letters to be read to the churches. From this there was a possible transition to the reading of the address by the author himself, and this quite certainly was done by the writer of the ancient homily known as the Second Epistle of Clement, though erroneously assigned to him. If this was done in one instance, why not in others? Still all we can say is that such cases of written and read discourses must have been exceptions to the general rule of the freely spoken address.

It is impossible to describe in general terms, with any degree of accuracy, the character of the audiences to which the preaching of the early centuries was addressed. The audiences were of course greatly varied according to times, places and circumstances. The two general classes of believers and unbelievers among the hearers must be recognized; but we have to consider whether any given audience was composed exclusively or predominantly of one class or the other, of whether the two classes were pretty evenly divided. These conditions have always characterized the hearing of Christian preaching, and they are too general to be of any special significance in the age which we are now studying, further than to occasion the remark that this twofold or threefold character of the audiences must already be dealt with, even in the beginnings of the history of preaching. Unbelievers were reached mainly by personal interviews, but there must have been some preaching to groups or crowds. In the apostolic times, as we know from the book of Acts, frequent use was made of the Jewish synagogues for proclaiming the gospel to the unbelieving Jews, and also to the Gentiles

¹ *Hist. Prea.*, p. 36.

² Rev. 1:3.

who might be in attendance. After that time, however, there must have been some falling off in this custom, as the antagonism of the Jews was intensified, and as Christianity became more and more Gentile in its personnel. Further, as the number of Christians grew, notwithstanding persecution, there would be increased attendance upon Christian worship by unbelievers, partly as led by curiosity and interest, and partly because of social, domestic, or other relations with Christian families.¹ Thus in various ways opportunity would be given and employed for heralding the gospel to unbelievers.

The regular customary assemblies for Christian worship were, however, the principal audiences for preaching. All through this period teaching and exhortation appear as part of the established order of worship in the churches. The custom came from the synagogue, and has been perpetuated through all the centuries. In the order of services, as was natural, the preaching usually followed the reading of the Scriptures, of which it was commonly a sort of exposition or hortatory application. We must also bear in mind the mixed character of the congregations even when properly called Christian. The old and young were there, men and women, the new convert and the tried and ripe believer, the hesitating and the stanch, the half doubter and the loyal, the far-off inquirer and the scoffing visitor, the nearer inquirers, of two kinds, "energumens" and "catechumens." The audiences were thus sufficiently varied in character to require different modes of address as circumstances might demand.

The material or contents of the early preaching did not in general character present any marked contrast to that which has ever since been the main staple of which sermons are made, but there was, as always, great difference in the details of volume, of grasp, of relative importance, and of presentation. The main elements of Christian discourse were three: the apostolic tradition, Scripture, and the personal contribution of the preacher. The last was then and always has been a greatly variable quantity, and the importance assigned to the first two

¹ Paul clearly intimates the possible presence of unbelievers in the assemblies for worship at Corinth in 1 Cor. 14:23.

has likewise varied much in different ages and in the minds of different preachers.

Just after the Apostles, and while the canon of Scripture was forming, it is easy to see that the apostolic tradition must justly have had a more prominent and authoritative place than it could properly claim in later times. For the Apostles themselves passed on to others what they knew and had received concerning the great facts and doctrines of the Christian faith.¹ Those who learned these things from the Apostles and their fellow laborers were the preachers of the early part of our period, and in the next remove those who learned them from the pupils of the apostolic men were the preachers of at latest the middle part of it, while in the latter part of this time the tradition still was comparatively fresh. But in process of time and in passing from one to another the newness became tarnished, accretions were made, distortions occurred, heresies crept in, and trustworthiness declined. Such deterioration must have soon set in, and later times only too sadly witness to the evil wrought by giving undue authority to untrustworthy legends, and to principles and customs falsely regarded as descending straight from the Apostles.

But in the good providence of God as the value of tradition declined the authority of Scripture, particularly of the New Testament books, came to be more and more recognized. The Old Testament scriptures had from the first been received by our Lord and his first followers as the sacred revelation of God to his chosen people. To early Jewish-Christians these holy writings were part both of their national heritage and of their new faith. By early Gentile-Christians they were readily accepted as God's word. The synagogue was the depository and the interpreter of the Old Testament, and the church easily and gladly received the sacred trust. Soon too the written Christian tradition as embodied in the Gospels and Acts began to correct or confirm the fainter growing oral testimony, while the Letters of the Apostles, carefully preserved, became the precious treasure of doctrine and duty for all the churches. All during the period under review the writings of the New Testament

¹ See Luke 1:1-4; 1 Cor. 11:2 (R. V.); 2 Tim. 2:2.

were coming more and more to be regarded as a part of the inspired revelation of God; and thus the canon of Scripture, substantially as we have it to-day, was practically completed by the end of the third century. Thus as the apostolic tradition became less direct, and what passed for it grew more corrupt, the preachers were furnished with that treasury of divine truth which the true Christian pulpit has ever recognized as the source of its teachings and the authority for its message. We shall see as we go on more in detail how the preaching of the early centuries dealt with the Scriptures in the way of interpretation and application. The treatment was inadequate and often unwise, but in this first age, as in all following ones, the Bible furnished the main basis and the most valuable element of preaching.

There is yet to be mentioned the personal element. Judging from the few remains that have come down to us, we can see that what has always been true of preaching since was true of it in the period we are studying. There was more or less individual freedom in handling both the scriptural and the traditional elements; and the illustration, reasoning, exposition, and application were largely the preacher's own work. His personality—thought, feeling, method—must mingle with his sources and characterize his product.

In form the sermons of the early times were unpretentious addresses, as their name "homilies"—conversations, talks—sufficiently indicates. They were without much logical order, and give little if any indication of a previously prepared outline. The character of the audience would determine whether the talk should be chiefly didactic or evangelistic, and the circumstances and purpose of the preacher would decide whether it should be principally doctrinal, expository, or hortatory; or how far any or all of these elements might be combined in one discourse. There was progress both toward a more orderly structure and a more expository character, and these tendencies were powerfully furthered by the example and teaching of Origen toward the end of the third century. Before his time Scripture was used in the homilies, but rather by way of quotation and application than as furnishing a text for exposition. But in his

hands continuous exposition with hortatory application became the rule.

In regard to the preservation and publication of sermons the age, as in many other things, was one of beginnings and tendencies. Sermon literature proper belongs to a later time. There is reason to suppose that in many cases the material used in epistles and other treatises had been first employed in oral address, and the apostolic epistles and others, as we have seen, were much of the nature of addresses. For sermons themselves, then as now, there were two ways of preservation: to be written by the preacher himself before or after delivery; and to be reported by others during or after delivery, with or without the author's revision. The Ancient Homily, which will presently claim fuller notice, is an example of the first method; the numerous homilies of Origen are an example of the second.¹ Shorthand writing (tachygraphy) was in vogue in those times, and oral discourses were often reported in this way. It has been reasonably conjectured² that the recognized superiority and value of the expository over the hortatory homilies led to the taking down and preservation of more of the expository kind than of others. It is to this that we owe our possession of comparatively so many more of Origen's expository homilies than of others. We cannot but wish that some of those old reporters had foreseen and benevolently considered the scholarly curiosity of our times.

4. THE PRINCIPAL PREACHERS OF THE AGE.

It is common to divide the literature of the first three centuries into three groups: the Apostolic Fathers, the Apologists, and the Ante-Nicene Theologians. While this classification is like all similar ones in not being rigidly accurate, it is very far from being arbitrary, for it is founded in the nature of the material and it corresponds fairly well with the course of events. It is also quite as convenient for the history of preaching as for that of general Christian literature, and is therefore

¹ Euseb., *H. E.*, VI., 23; and L., 6.

² Rothe, *Gesch. der Pred.*, S. 13.

adopted here. It will be noticed in the discussion following that the time limits of the different groups overlap, though there is succession. Thus the Apologists followed the Apostolic Fathers, but began before their predecessors had finished their work; and the Theologians prior to the Nicene council were many of them contemporary with the later Apologists.

The literary remains embraced under the title Apostolic Fathers consist of the writings of men who were, or may reasonably be supposed to have been, in direct contact with some of the Apostles themselves. Their age may be considered as extending from the death of the Apostles (68 or 100) to a date just past the middle of the second century, say 160. The literature of the period is scanty in amount and of little intrinsic value, but because it is all that we have its relative importance is beyond estimate. Its homiletical worth is almost nothing, as it contains only one homily properly so-called, and its notices of preaching are not very numerous or clear. We need not discuss these writings, but only notice the three foremost preachers of the time, and give some account of its only remaining sermon.

Polycarp (69?-155), bishop or pastor of the church at Smyrna, was a loving disciple of John the Apostle. He suffered martyrdom under the reign of Antoninus Pius in 155. When asked to renounce his faith in view of the stake he said that he had been serving his Lord for eighty-six years and could not renounce him now. This would put back the date of his birth or baptism to the year 69, according as he meant all his life or all his Christian life. He was a noble and beloved man and pastor. One of his writings, an Epistle to the Philippians (date probably before 150), remains, and indicates his pious character and a warm earnestness which must have marked his preaching.

Ignatius was bishop at Antioch. He also suffered martyrdom, and the date of his death lies between the years 107 and 115. There remain a number of epistles attributed to him, but their genuineness is much disputed. Allowing that a few, in substance at least, are really his, they exhibit more intellectual power than Polycarp had and a greater vehemence of nature, but less of poise,

moderation, holiness. Yet he must have been a preacher of considerable force.

The most important of the three, however, is perhaps Clement of Rome (d. c. 100), whose Epistle to the Corinthians, of date about 97, is the oldest specimen of post-apostolic literature. He may be the Clement of whom Paul speaks in Philippians 4:3, and was one of the first bishops of the Roman church. His letter shows the Roman dignity and capacity for administration. Of his preaching there is no mention nor certain trace, but his force of character and his position render some testimony to his power as a teacher of the word.

But passing the preachers we notice now the only homiletical relic of this earliest age. This is an ancient document which has been commonly called the Second Epistle of Clement.¹ Only a fragment of it was known to modern scholars till a comparatively recent date. But even in this fragmentary form its Clementine authorship was disputed, and its true nature as a homily rather than an epistle was suspected. The discovery of the complete text has confirmed both these opinions, and makes it now clear that Clement of Rome was not its author. From a passage in the writing itself² we learn that it was read by the author to the congregation immediately after the reading of the Scriptures in worship, and from this and other indications its homiletical character is established. The authorship must be left in doubt, but Lightfoot's ingenious conjecture may be provisionally accepted, that it is a homily of a bishop or presbyter of the Corinthian church. Its date is probably about 135-140, but it is not certainly fixed.

The theme of the homily is the duty of living the right sort of Christian life as a recompense to Christ for the gift of salvation. There is no clear-cut division of the matter, but the two leading thoughts are, confession of Christ, and repentance, as necessary to the Christian life. These are repeatedly urged and enforced in a variety of ways and from a variety of motives. The doctrine is not elaborate, the homily being hortatory in character, but the main great teachings of the Christian faith are

¹ Riddle's notes, and the translation of the homily in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VII., p. 372 ff and p. 512 ff. ² Chap. 19.

implied, and for all that appears to the contrary the treatment is orthodox. The morality urged is sound and elevated. The style is natural, simple and appropriate; but is not marked by special oratorical excellence, is somewhat feeble, and is marred by much repetition. The use of Scripture is reverent. There is no text, but the quotations and allusions are frequent, and derived from both the Old and the New Testament. This is significant for the early recognition of the New Testament writings as authoritative in pulpit use. The interpretation and application are fairly good. There is no wild allegorizing or forcing of Scripture. The tone and spirit are admirable—faith, hope, and love, with humility and sincerity, are apparent throughout. Particularly worthy of note is a passage near the end, where the preacher modestly declares that though conscious of imperfection he tries to do what he urges upon others, and begs his hearers to think on these things after they leave the house of worship and go about their affairs. He earnestly exhorts them in view of the future life, and tenderly consoles them in the midst of present trials, concluding with a doxology.

Next after these Apostolic Fathers we take up the important group of early Christian writers known as the Apologists. The reigns of the so-called, "Five Good Emperors," extending over about eighty years and lying chiefly within the second century, are the golden age of Roman imperial rule. Yet within these reigns Christians were hated and persecuted, though not so severely as in later times. It is a painful fact that Marcus Aurelius, the best of all the Roman emperors, and one of the wisest, most humane and just of all earthly rulers, looked upon Christianity with contempt, and permitted, if he did not encourage, the persecution of its votaries. Before his time the peaceful and energetic administration of Hadrian (117-138) offered a fair occasion for the rise of a notable class of Christian writers, who defended their faith from the attacks of its enemies, and the succeeding reigns were such as to render this kind of work still necessary and not hopeless. Hence we have the Christian Apologists of the second century.¹ There was demand

¹Cf. A. H. Newman, *Manual of Ch. Hist.*, Vol. I., p. 237 ff., and many other authorities, especially also *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Am. ed.

and response. The persecution and misrepresentation of Christianity called for defence. Its remarkable progress among the people and its growing favor with some among the upper classes of society had called forth not only violent social and ostensibly legal opposition, but also many foul calumnies as a pretext for persecution. There were now among the Christians a number of acute and educated men, philosophers, lawyers and others, who were capable of doing this work, and they did it.

Besides those whose writings place them among the Apologists, there were, no doubt, many excellent and worthy preachers in this time. One of these was Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, of whom Eusebius¹ says, "He imparted freely not only to his own people but to others abroad also the blessings of his divine labors." Among the Apologists whose names and works (or notices of them) have come down to us, some were preachers, though not all. Of these the most important for us were Justin Martyr and Tertullian, who, though his *Apologeticus* and other writings place him in this group, is more properly reckoned among the Theologians. Others were: Quadratus, who is probably to be identified with a bishop, and therefore a preacher, at Athens in that time; Melito, bishop of Sardis, who was a strong man, and is called a "prophet;" and Theophilus the sixth bishop of Antioch, whose apology addressed to one Autolycus is vigorous and written in a good style which suggests his power as a speaker.

On the whole, while technically no sermons remain from this group of preachers, their writings and those of their lay fellow-laborers reveal traces of a vigorous and fruitful ministry of the Word. The Apologists had as a rule more culture and more intellectual power than the Apostolic Fathers. There is evidence in their writings of wide reading, considerable acquaintance with literature and philosophy, and no small degree of vigor and grasp of mind.

Their best representative was Justin (c. 100-165), afterwards called the Martyr. He was a very able and interesting man. He was born probably about the beginning of the second century, at Neapolis (the ancient

¹ *H. E.*, IV., 23.

Sychem) in Samaria, of heathen parents. It is uncertain whether they were of Greek or Roman extraction. Justin was well educated, and seems to have had means sufficient to lead a life of travel and study. He sought mental rest in various systems of philosophy, except Epicureanism which he hated, and was about to settle down into Platonism when he was converted to Christianity. He met one day near the seashore a pleasant-faced old man, who engaged him in conversation and made known to him the Christian faith. This led to his conversion, and he found peace of mind. He became an earnest defender of Christianity. He travelled much, retaining his philosopher's cloak, not so much now because it was a badge of distinction, as because it gave him the opportunity to teach, with the authority of culture, the truths of his religion. He was not ordained a presbyter, but found frequent occasion to discourse to the few or many who might be attracted to hear him concerning the faith. He awakened the jealousy and opposition of a philosopher named Crescens, at whose instigation probably he was condemned and martyred under Marcus Aurelius, about 165. His three writings—the First and Second Apology and the Dialogue with Trypho the Jew—are of great value for what they teach as to the doctrines and customs of the Christians of his time. They also give us a fairly good idea of his views, his mental capacity, and his style. He handled the Scriptures quite freely, dealing mainly with the prophecies as fulfilled in Christ. He had some wrong notions, but was deeply in earnest and must have been a preacher of some eloquence and power.

The third group of early Christian writers is that of the Ante-Nicene Theologians, whose work may be regarded as covering the time from Irenæus, say 180, to Arnobius, about 300.¹ This was a time of short reigns and great confusion and turmoil in the empire. It was also the period in which occurred the worst persecutions of the Christians; those under Severus (202), Maximin (235-238), Decius (249-251), Valerian (257-258), and Diocletian (303), being very severe. It was too late to

¹ Various editions of their works. For American readers *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, as before.

suppress Christianity by governmental force. In spite of opposition it had only grown stronger. Now with this accession of strength there came men of classical and philosophical culture, to whom it was natural to philosophize about the faith and to endeavor to formulate its truths. Parallel with this tendency was the work of the Apologists already noticed, and the development of church unity and organization. And, most influential of all, there had been from earliest times heresies and sects disturbing the clear stream of Christian doctrine. All these things contributed to the rise of the class of theologians who grappled with the great thoughts revealed in Scripture, and sought to develop them into something of a philosophic system. Allowing for individual differences, it is fair to say in general terms of these Christian thinkers that for the most part they were men of fine mental gifts, good education, ample learning, deep knowledge of Scripture, elevated morals, and devoted piety. As scholars and theologians, notwithstanding some faults and vagaries, they must ever hold high rank in religious history, and their writings are a priceless source of knowledge concerning the men, events, customs, and opinions of Christianity in their time.

Many of these theologians were notable and useful preachers of the word, yet very few specimens of their homiletic work remain, except in the single case of Origen. We are dependent upon their writings, and upon such scanty notices of their preaching as may be given by others, for our imperfect estimate of their work and power as preachers. During their time and in their hands the informal and familiar homily of previous times made decided advance toward the more oratorical and elaborate address or sermon of the next period. While others contributed to this development, the greatest single personal force in it was the eminent scholar and teacher Origen, of Alexandria and Cæsarea. He was one of those leaders of thought whose faculty and privilege it is to perceive, exemplify and guide, if they do not originate, some tendency or tendencies of the age in which they live. A more particular account of him will be given later. It is sufficient to quote here the summary statement of Christlieb;¹ "Through Origen the sermon received the

¹ *Art. Gesch. der Predigt*, Herzog, R. E., 18, supplement.

fixed form of an explanation and application of a text."

For convenience of study we may consider the great theologians as falling into an eastern and a western group, in each of which there are again two clearly distinguished schools, namely, in the East the Alexandrian and Antiochian, and in the West the Græco-Roman and the North African. We shall notice them in the order just given.

At Alexandria there was founded in early times, date not known, a school for the instruction of catechumens. It grew into a school for the training of teachers and preachers, and was at various times under the headship of highly distinguished men. Of these the two most important for us are Clement and Origen.

Clement (c. 160-220) was born probably at Athens near the middle of the second century. He was highly educated, and trained in the Greek philosophy. Seeking light he came to Alexandria, and was brought to Christianity by Pantænus at that time head of the catechetical school there. About 190 he succeeded Pantænus as leader in the school, was banished about 202, and probably died not later than 220. Not much can be known of his preaching from his great and valuable theological writings. But among them is an Outline (Hypotyposis) of the Catholic Epistles which is a sort of expository discourse, and in it, as Christlieb says, "the first germs of the homily show themselves." Clement was a many-sided man, theologian, exegete, poet, preacher. His influence on Origen was deep and formative, and through his illustrious pupil he has left a broad mark on preaching and on Christian thought.

As a point of secondary importance in his relation to preaching it may be noted that for polemical purposes he has preserved in his writings¹ two homilies (fragments) of the famous Gnostic, Valentinus. Of these Broadus² says that they "are of curious interest but not homiletically instructive." But they, at least, show that the form of the "homily" was already coming into vogue, and that heretics as well as the orthodox preached.

The greatest name among the Alexandrian theologians is that of the learned scholar and eminent Christian,

¹ *Stromat.*, IV., 13.

² *Hist. Prea.*, p. 45.

Origen (185-254). He was born at Alexandria, probably about 185, of Christian parents. He was trained in Christian lore from his childhood, and like many another clever boy puzzled his father with precocious and hard questions. When his father suffered martyrdom in 202 Origen exhorted him to courage and himself desired the martyr's crown, boy though he was, but was hindered from giving himself up to the inquisitors by the ingenuity of his mother, who hid all his clothes while he was undressed, and thus kept him at home till the danger or the impulse had passed by. He was from his youth a rigorous ascetic.¹ As a student he became so proficient in the Scriptures that on the banishment of his master Clement he was, though a very young man, appointed to succeed that great teacher in the catechetical school. His expository lectures were so highly valued that they were written or dictated after delivery, and published as commentaries. A wealthy man named Ambrosius was his friend and patron, and furnished the means for employing the amanuenses and copyists. To this man's kind liberality and appreciation of genius we owe our possession of so many of Origen's works. Later, according to Eusebius,² when he was sixty years of age, he permitted his extemporaneous discourses to be taken down by shorthand writers. This was after his ordination as a presbyter, and these discourses are his homilies on various books of the Bible.

So marked was his success as an expounder of Scripture that on a visit to Palestine he was invited to preach in church. This led to trouble, as he was not yet ordained. Whereupon the bishop of Jerusalem ordained him a presbyter. This gave great offence to his own bishop at Alexandria, by whom in 232 a council was called and Origen was deposed.³ On this account he permanently left Alexandria and set up a school at Cæsarea in Palestine. Here he died under persecution in 254.

His services to the development of preaching were

¹ In an excess of youthful zeal, to avoid temptation, and taking Matt. 19:12 literally, he mutilated himself.

² *H. E.*, L., 6.

³ One of the principal grounds urged for this action was his mutilation. He was also accused of heresy.

great.¹ He showed by example the importance of expository preaching. He was a careful scholar, and took great pains to expound the Scriptures and to make the sacred text the real basis of preaching. But with this good service must be reckoned the harm he did by lending the sanction of his great influence to the allegorical method of interpretation. He held and taught a threefold sense of Scripture—grammatical, moral, spiritual (or allegorical)—and regarded the last as the best. While he was not, strictly speaking, the originator of this method, he is perhaps more responsible than any one else for giving it dignity and enabling it to fasten such a tremendous grip on the pulpit of all ages.

In regard to Origen's character and his views as a preacher, we have some interesting statements by Eusebius, and some hints here and there in his own writings. Not only did his extraordinary ability attract many to his lectures, both at Alexandria in his youth and at Cæsarea in his age, but his warmth of nature, his enthusiasm and his sympathy won men to him. All this stirred up enemies and persecutors. But he bravely and faithfully held on his course. Eusebius² tells of all this and quotes as a current saying concerning Origen that "as his doctrine, so was his life; and as his life, so also was his doctrine."

Origen left no formal treatise on preaching, but Nebe³ has gathered and put together from his writings a number of items regarding the spirit and method of his work. He believed both in the divine call and qualification of the preacher, and also in the need of human effort to acquire and improve the divine gift of prophecy. He cared little for heathen rhetoric and art in speech, but much for the simple, clear, forcible exposition of God's word. He insisted that the preacher should himself be pure and reverent that he might properly teach his hearers the truth of God. There is a tradition—certainly true to the spirit of the man if not actually a fact—that once when he was going to preach his eyes chanced to fall on Psalm

¹ See Broadus, *Hist. Prea.*, p. 51 ff. For his qualities as a preacher see Lentz, *Christliche Homiletik*, Bd. I., S. 33 ff., Paniel, S. 178 ff., and Nebe, *Zur Geschichte der Predigt*, Bd. I., S. 1 ff., an especially good discussion.

² *H. E.*, VI., 3.

³ *Zur Gesch. der Pred.*, I., S. 8 ff.

50:16, "But unto the wicked God saith, What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth?" and that he was so overcome with emotion he could not go on for his tears. As the source of the sermon must be the word of God, so its supreme end must be the spiritual edification of the hearer, and to this end there must be both instruction and exhortation. So he insists that the teacher should know both the word and the hearts of men. It was this earnest desire to make all the word of God alike spiritually profitable, which led him into the mistake of extreme allegorical interpretation. In this he has no consistent principle, and often gives the rein to fancy. His Greek was simple, conversational, chaste. He soared to no oratorical heights, nor did he descend to the colloquial and vulgar.

Nearly two hundred of his homilies on the Bible remain, chiefly in the free and inaccurate Latin translations of Rufinus and Jerome. In the original Greek there are extant only nineteen, all on the book of Jeremiah.¹ Of these, according to Klostermann, there were originally probably forty-three, but only the nineteen have been preserved. The same scholar thinks that they were probably delivered at Cæsarea between the years 242 and 244, and were among those mentioned by Eusebius as having been taken down by shorthand writers as they were delivered. We have the Latin translations of these also, and they show how very free and often inaccurate the translators were.

As a sample of Origen's manner the following literal translation of the opening paragraph of the sixteenth homily on Jeremiah is offered:² Jer. 16:16, "Behold I will send for many fishers, saith the Lord, and they shall fish them; and after will I send for many hunters and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks."

"It is written in the Gospel according to Matthew that our Saviour came by the Sea of Galilee and saw Simon and Andrew his brother casting a net into the sea; for they were fishers. Then says the Word that the

¹ See Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, tom. 13, col. 255 ss., also Klostermann in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, neue Folge, I., 3, *Die Überlieferung der Jeremia-Homilien des Origenes*.

² Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, tom. 13, col. 457 ss.

Saviour seeing them said, 'Come after me, and I will make you fishers of men; but they, leaving their nets, followed him.' And Jesus made them still to take up fishing. And he found two other brothers, James the son of Zebedee and John his brother, in the boat with their father mending the nets; and these he called to the same craft [lit. skill]. He has made them also fishers of men. Now, if any one should consider those who have from God a grace of speech filled as a dragnet, and woven from the holy Scriptures as a cast-net, so that the network should encompass the souls of the hearers; and should also cleverly perceive that this came about according to the skill which Jesus taught; he will see how not only then, but also now our Saviour sends fishers of men, training them in order that we may be able to come up from the sea and flee its bitter waves. But those fish, the irrational ones, coming up in the seines and in the cast-nets and in the dragnets or on the hooks, die a real death because life does not follow death. But he who is taken by the fishers of Jesus, and comes up from the sea, he also indeed dies, but he dies to the world, he dies to sin, and after dying to the world and to sin, he is made alive by the word of God and takes on another life; as though you could by supposition see the soul of the fish changing, after it had come out of the fishy body, and becoming something better than a fish. I take this as an example. Let no one make objection concerning things he never heard of—let him imagine such a thing. Thou hast come up from the sea, falling into the nets of the disciples of Jesus; coming forth thou changest thy soul, thou art no longer a fish, passing thy time in the briny waves of the sea; but at once thy soul changes, and is transformed, and becomes something better and diviner than it formerly was. But that it is transformed and changed hear Paul saying, 'But we all with unveiled face gazing as in a mirror upon the glory of the Lord are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as from the Lord, the Spirit.' And being thus transformed, the fish that is caught by the fishers of Jesus, leaving the haunts of the sea makes his haunts in the mountains, so that he no longer needs the fishers who bring him up from the sea, but those second ones, such as are called hunters, who

hunt from every mountain and from every hill. Thou, therefore, having come up from the sea, and having been caught in the nets of the disciples of Jesus, change from the sea, forget it, come up upon the mountains, the prophets, and upon the hills, the righteous, and make there thy haunts, in order that after these things, when the time of thy departure is at hand, the many hunters may be sent forth, other than the fishers. But who could these be but those who have been appointed for the purpose of receiving the souls that are in the hills, that are no longer lying below? And see if the prophet has not mystically called out saying these things, and offering this thought, when he says, 'Behold I send many fishers, saith the Lord, and they shall fish them; and afterwards I will send many hunters and they shall hunt them upon every mountain, and upon every hill.' "

Here we see something of Origen's exuberant fancy in interpretation, but he has much that is more extreme than this. Here too we catch glimpses of his reverent spirit, and observe his engaging, unpretentious, but not lofty or moving style. His lack of orderly method is also apparent. In his work generally there is considerable acuteness of interpretation with much fanciful allegorizing, but there is also earnest appeal and sound practical application. He was not an orator, but a teacher by instinct and experience. But take him all in all, both for what he himself did and for what he influenced others to do, he was the most important preacher of the third century.

A devoted pupil of Origen during his Cæsarean ministry was Gregory, afterward surnamed Thaumaturgus (Wonderworker) in order to distinguish him from others of the name. He was born at Neo-Cæsarea in Pontus, about 210. Coming to Palestine on some business he heard of Origen's lectures at Cæsarea and came to hear him. This led to his conversion to Christianity and to his lifelong devotion to his great teacher and friend. He studied with Origen eight years, and then took leave of him in a fulsome panegyric which has come down to us. It was in the fashion of the time and decidedly overdone; but it exhibits both a high appreciation of his teacher and a certain rhetorical power.

Returning to his home in Pontus, Gregory devoted himself to religious work among his own people. Soon on account of his piety, ability and zeal he was, much against his will, made bishop. It is said that he found on his return from Palestine only seventeen Christians in his neighborhood; but his earnest and fruitful labors for thirty years spread Christianity through all that region, and hundreds were brought to Christ through him. This great success, perhaps, rather than reputation for miracle-working, earned him his surname of *Thaumaturgus*. His success speaks more of his power as a preacher than his overwrought Panegyric on Origen, or the few and probably not genuine homilies which have been ascribed to him.

These three were the most important of the oriental group of preachers among the Theologians, but a word must be said regarding the other school of eastern theologians which had its seat at Antioch.¹ Its most famous representatives belong to a later time. But Lucian and Dorotheus are named as having been in charge of a school at Antioch as early as 280. This is regarded as the beginning of the line of theologians and preachers of the Antiochian school, whose distinction it was to urge and exemplify the literal, historical and grammatical interpretation of Scripture as opposed to the fanciful allegorical method of the Alexandrian school.

We must now turn our attention to the western group of the Ante-Nicene Theologians, and give brief consideration to those among them who are chiefly important as preachers. And here we observe a very important line of distinction. Some of these men used the Greek tongue in their writings, and presumably also in speech. This was in Italy and Gaul. But in North Africa, chiefly though not exclusively, there arose a great line of thinkers who used the Latin, and became the founders of the Latin theology.

Clement and other early bishops of the Roman church used the Greek language. How long it was before Latin asserted its rightful claim, and became the churchly as it was the vernacular speech of the West, is not known. Most probable is the conjecture² that both languages were

¹ See Cruttwell, *Literary History of Christianity*, Vol. II., p. 532.

² Cruttwell, *op. cit.*, II., p. 405.

used for a while in worship and documents. But about the time of bishop Victor (187) there is a decided change toward the dominant use of Latin. Among the leaders who are worthy of mention as preachers two only need claim our notice here.

Some time before the middle of the second century there was born somewhere in Asia Minor one who was to receive the name of Irenæus—the peaceful one—was to be a pupil of the venerable Polycarp, who had sat at the feet of the beloved John, and yet was to be in the far West in mature life the laborious bishop and the stout antagonist of “all the heresies.” In his youth Irenæus received a good education, and was well taught in the Scriptures and in the earlier Christian writings. He became a man of great piety and simplicity of character. While he was working as a missionary in Gaul, the bishop of Lyons was martyred (177), and the courageous evangelist succeeded to the dangerous post. Schaff says of him, “He combined vast literary and missionary activity.” He is lost to view after 190. A somewhat doubtful tradition tells that he suffered martyrdom under Septimius Severus in 202. His greatest work, *Against Heresies*, appeared about 185. No sermons remain. His writings are hard and tedious. He modestly disclaims eloquence, and he probably had no high oratorical gifts, but he was an able, wise, earnest, useful pastor and diligent preacher.

Much more notable as a preacher was the great controversialist, Hippolytus (170-236), of whom Schaff¹ cleverly says that he has lived three lives: the real one in the third century, a fictitious one as a canonized saint in the Middle Ages, and a literary one in the nineteenth century since the recovery of his works. Of his real life little is known. His name and his use of Greek indicate Grecian parentage, though not necessarily eastern birth. He is mentioned by Eusebius² as a bishop, but without designation of place, and Jerome in his *Illustrious Men*

¹ *Church Hist.*, Vol. II., p. 758. Cf. also Bunsen, *Hippolytus and Callistus*; and a supplement (on Hippolytus' relations to Origen) by Trümpelmann in Rothe's *Geschichte der Predigt*. Further, Cruttwell, *op. cit.*, II., p. 403, and Achelis, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N. F., I., 4. ² *H. E.*, VI., 20, 22.

speaks of him as bishop of "some church" (*cujusdam ecclesiæ*); but his real place remains unknown. Later tradition says he was bishop of Portus near the mouth of the Tiber, while some have conjectured that he was assistant bishop, or rival bishop, of Rome. At any rate he was called a bishop, had a good deal to do with the Roman church, and got into a quarrel with Callistus, the contemporary Roman bishop, whom he handles very severely in one of his writings. It seems that he was banished by the Emperor Maximin, about 235, to the mines of Sardinia, where he soon died.

In the sixteenth century a sitting statue, supposed to be his, was found. On the back of it a number of writings attributed to him are enumerated. He wrote a large number of controversial works. What of his preaching? Eusebius speaks of him as an "eloquent" man, and Jerome tells how he once delivered a notable sermon on the Praise of the Lord and Saviour, in a church at Rome, in presence of Origen who was visiting there at the time. This sermon has not come down to us, but there is preserved one on the Holy Theophany¹ at the baptism of Jesus, which with some probability may be regarded as genuine.² It is a baptismal sermon addressed to a candidate—probably a prominent person—for baptism, and at the same time to the congregation. It followed the reading of the Scripture lesson, on which it is based as a text. There is considerable quotation of Scripture. The doctrine is not elaborate. It is sound on the Trinity, does not discuss atonement or grace, and teaches, but not baldly, the necessity of baptism to salvation. In the conclusion the preacher exhorts his hearers to come and be baptized, but only on the basis of a sound repentance and in the exercise of faith. In structure and style the homily is suggestive and eloquent, and secures for its author a place among the true preachers of his age.

It is a curious fact that the beginnings of Latin theology are found in North Africa rather than in Rome. Of those who were notable among the North African theologians two at least claim notice as preachers.

¹ Translated in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., p. 234.

² Questioned by Achelis, *op. cit.*, S. 199 ff., but accepted by Zahn, Lightfoot and others.

One of the most eminent Christian writers of his own or any age was Tertullian (150-220). He was born about the year 150 at Carthage, where his father was a centurion in the Roman army in the service of the proconsul of the province. Tertullian received a good education in his youth, and became an advocate, it seems at Rome. After a somewhat wild youth he was converted when about forty years old, and became a very earnest Christian. Later he joined the strict sect of the Montanists. He was at one time a presbyter, probably at Carthage, as we learn from Jerome; but he was not promoted, and, probably on account of his Montanism, never attained distinction as a church officer. His chief title to consideration is in his numerous and variously valuable writings. Apologetic, doctrinal and controversial treatises flowed from his hand in rapid succession. Of these Broadus says,¹ "The writings of Tertullian amply show that he was a born orator. His penetrating insight into subjects, his splendid imagination, his overpowering passion, the torrent-like movement of his style, heedless of elegance and of grammatical accuracy, his very exaggerations and his fiery assaults upon his antagonists, all seem to show the man born to be a speaker." His treatises on moral and spiritual subjects, especially the beautiful ones on Patience and on Penitence, have decided oratorical character. They read as if they had been written out after first being spoken as hortatory addresses or sermons.

Like Tertullian, his predecessor and master, Cyprian (c. 200-258) was the son of a Roman officer, and born and bred at Carthage. He was educated for a teacher of rhetoric, but was early converted to Christianity and became one of the most celebrated churchmen and writers of his time. He was greatly indebted to Tertullian, though it does not appear that there was any personal contact. If there was it was when Tertullian was very old and Cyprian very young. On his conversion in 246 Cyprian gave both himself and his means to Christianity. His piety, learning and ability, both in letters and affairs were recognized at home, and he was soon made bishop of his native city. During the Decian persecution he pru-

¹ *Hist. of Prea.*, p. 45 ff.

dently retired, but kept the oversight of his flock, and his letters at this period are an interesting and valuable body of literature. Though not dictated by cowardice, his retirement was misunderstood and criticized. So during the persecution under Valerian he remained at his post and was banished, but on venturing back he was martyred in 258. He met his end with dignity and composure.

He was a theological writer of marked ability and importance, and was especially distinguished for his advocacy of church unity and catholicity. He did not, however, as is frequently supposed, admit the papal supremacy of the Roman bishop, though allowing great weight to that see in ecclesiastical affairs. As in case of Tertullian we must judge of Cyprian's preaching from his writings. Those which bear on Scriptural and moral subjects may probably have first served as sermons. His charming exposition of the Lord's Prayer,¹ for example, has many homiletical excellences, and reads much like a reproduced address. In his letter to Donatus² he discusses briefly but intelligently the difference between secular and sacred eloquence, and his speech is highly praised by Lactantius,³ who says: "He had a ready, copious and pleasant faculty, and that clearness which is the greatest excellence in a discourse, so that it would be difficult to say whether he was more ornate in stating, or ready in illustrating, or powerful in persuading."

5. SUMMARY.

In closing this imperfect survey of preaching during the important, fruitful but disappointingly obscure age that elapsed from the close of the work of the Apostles in the first century to the great council of Nicæa in the early part of the fourth, we may attempt a brief summary of its leading characteristics.

1. There was profound conviction of the truth of the gospel, and of its power to redeem men from sin. Along with this there was true earnestness in presenting it to the minds and hearts of men, both as a scheme of salvation and as a rule of thought and life.

¹ Fish's *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*, I., p. 36 ff.

² Quoted in Ker's *History of Preaching*, p. 99. ³ *Ibid.*

2. For the most part the preaching of the time teaches a pure and lofty morality, in marked contrast to the principles and practices of the age.

3. The preaching is firmly based on the authority of the Scriptures, both of the Old and of the New Testament, as a revelation of the thought and will of God; and is increasingly occupied with the exposition and application of the Word.

4. Of doctrinal preaching, as later and now commonly understood, there was little if any. Yet the main great teachings of the Christian system, while not yet formally stated, are with more or less clearness held or implied. The term *trinity* (in Greek *trias*) has already appeared, to describe the relations of the three Persons of the Godhead; man's sinful nature and need of deliverance by Christ are recognized; repentance and faith are insisted on, as the proper relation of man toward God, and the means of securing the blessing of salvation; and the ideas of the future life of glory or of punishment are firmly held. Along with this there is a growing conception of church unity and universality, and of the efficacy of the ordinances, particularly of baptismal regeneration.

On the whole our actual knowledge of the preaching and preachers of that age is confessedly inadequate and scanty. We are left largely to inference and conjecture. But from such specimens, traditions and traces as we have, we certainly know that there were those who planted and those who watered in that obscure early time, to whose labors God gave the increase, for they like Apollos were "mighty in the Scriptures," and their preaching like that of Paul "was in demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

CHAPTER II

THE CULMINATION OF ANCIENT PREACHING IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

The course of events in empire and church from the accession of Constantine (306) to and including the reigns of Arcadius in the East (d. 408) and of Honorius in the West (d. 423) had profound influence upon the history

of civilization, of Christianity, of preaching. Schaff¹ eloquently summarizes the main points of the situation as follows: "The reign of Constantine the Great marks the transition of the Christian religion from under persecution by the secular government to union with the same—the beginning of the state-church system. The Græco-Roman heathenism, the most cultivated and powerful form of idolatry which history knows, surrenders, after three hundred years' struggle, to Christianity, and dies of incurable consumption. . . . The successor of Nero, Domitian, and Diocletian appears in the imperial purple at the council of Nice as protector of the church, and takes his golden throne at the nod of bishops who still bear the marks of persecution. The despised sect, which, like its Founder in the days of his humiliation, had not where to lay its head, is raised to sovereign authority in the state, enters into the prerogatives of the pagan priesthood, grows rich and powerful, builds countless churches out of the stones of idol temples to the honor of Christ and his martyrs, employs the wisdom of Greece and Rome to vindicate the foolishness of the cross, exerts a molding power upon civil legislation, rules the national life, and leads off the history of the world." These are no extravagant words, but a sound, if glowing, statement of the facts.

The troubled reigns of the sons of Constantine prepared the way for the brief and ineffectual reaction toward paganism under their cousin the emperor Julian, commonly known as the Apostate, because he hated Christianity and tried to re-establish the old heathen religion in the empire. This he did not try to do by persecution, however, but by ridicule, social contempt, and various other ways. But the effort to revive heathenism came too late. Julian's successor, Jovian, was a Christian, and in his brief reign restored imperial favor to Christianity. This was true of Valentinian also and his successors. Valens, associated with Valentinian, and emperor of the East, favored the Arian party and thus caused much trouble. Theodosius the Great, called to the sovereignty of the East on the death of Valens, favored orthodoxy, or the Athanasian party. He was a great and

¹ *Hist. of the Christian Church*, Vol. III., pp. 4, 5.

capable ruler, with some serious faults of character, but according to his light a sincere Christian. After him the empire was finally divided, his two weak sons being his successors, Arcadius in the East, Honorius in the West. Under these degenerate princes affairs went sadly enough. The western empire was tottering to its fall, while in the East corruption, luxury, effeminacy and decay were rife. And while the Goths without and decay within were hastening the ruin of the old Roman civilization, fierce controversies were tearing Christianity in twain. It was a strange, fearful, corrupt, uneasy age. Yet in such a time as this lived and spoke the greatest preachers of the ancient Christian world; for it is precisely in the fourth and the early years of the fifth century that Christian preaching in its ancient development reached its culmination.

I. CONDITIONS FAVORABLE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PREACHING

We have already observed, and shall have frequent occasion to do so again as we go along, how responsive preaching is to its environment. Like every other great exercise of the spirit of man it is in touch with each successive age through which it works. Hindering and favoring forces meet it in every period, and it will decline or flourish as one set or the other are stronger. When favorable conditions are in the ascendant what would be serious drawbacks often become incitements to higher life and greater activity. Thus a pleasure-loving, corrupt age may be both a hindrance and a stimulus to preaching, and other things must help to decide in each case or time which it shall rather be. Now these conditions lie partly in external affairs and partly in preaching itself.

In the affairs of the empire and the church there came together many things at this time to exercise from without a favorable influence upon the oratorical development of preaching.

During the intervals of persecution, and indeed to some extent stimulated by persecution, there had been great extension of Christian power and influence. The church was also growing in organization and deepening its in-

fluence as a great visible power over its own members. At the opening of the fourth century it was distinctly a power in society that had to be reckoned with. Diocletian's last and terrible attempt to suppress Christianity by imperial force had clearly failed. Society and government must accept as an established institution this obstinate and irrepressible body of followers of Jesus Christ. So as the church forced itself more and more into social recognition, all that concerned it, especially its worship, must acquire respect and dignity. As a part of the worship preaching had its own claim to recognition. And as the worship became more elaborate and attractive, more observed and attended, this peculiar feature of it came to be a more formal and stately affair. The development of preaching toward an oratorical form was thus an integral part of the general ecclesiastical movement.

Whatever we may think of the conversion of Constantine, he was at least wise enough to see that as a matter of statecraft it was time to change the policy of many preceding emperors. Christianity was here to stay, it could not be crushed, why not use it? Christians were a numerous and a worthy class of citizens, why not give them a better chance? Was not their friendship and aid better than their hatred and opposition? At any rate, whatever his motives, Constantine reversed the policy of Diocletian and Galerius, even persuading the latter to join him in the first decree of toleration in 311. Two years later a stronger decree was enacted, and thus in 313 Christianity was the recognized religion of the empire. Ten years more passed, and in 323 Constantine became sole emperor with power to make his wishes respected throughout the Roman world. And in two years more, 325, we find him presiding at the first general church council called by him at the instance of Christian dignitaries to decide the great controversy between Arians and Athanasians as to the divinity of Christ.

With the exception of Julian, as already noted, Constantine's successors followed his general policy, but favored now the Arian and now the orthodox party in the church. The emperor was to all intents and purposes as supreme in the church as in the state. This brought a dangerous gift of political and social prestige to the

church and inevitably disturbed its spirituality and purity, but at the same time it gave a certain distinction to all the institutions and characteristic actions of the church, including preaching. Attending church and hearing preachers became a social function. As Broadus aptly says,¹ "Fashionable people in Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and hundreds of smaller towns, began to speak (so Chrysostom intimates) almost as enthusiastically about the favorite preacher of the hour as they spoke of the favorite horse in the races, or the reigning actor in the theatre."

At a far later period the court of Louis XIV. of France smiled on preaching and made it a sort of pastime to hear the great pulpit orators of that age. The natural effect of this sort of stimulus in preaching soon proves unhealthy, but at first considerably, and always to some extent, it gives the really earnest preacher a much desired opportunity for addressing people of the highest consideration in society and bringing them to the Saviour, while at the same time it encourages a style of speech adapted to cultured hearers. In both the directions, then, of real eloquence and of artistic oratory the stimulus of social prestige made itself felt in fourth century preaching.

Back of the special stimulus of imperial patronage and social favor, only brought out and emphasized by these, lay the general taste of the age for oratorical display. The great political oratory of free Greece and Rome had long been crushed by despotism, but the love of it had not died out of the hearts of the descendants of those who had heard Demosthenes and Cicero and their lesser fellow-countrymen and orators. The pleadings in law courts offered only a partial off-set to the loss of free political oratory, and the harangues of the Senate had woefully degenerated. Occasions for panegyric orations there still were, and this style of oratory was still in vogue. The public assemblies for worship of a now favored religion came as a welcome addition, with the charm of some novelty, to these older occasions for popular eloquence. The taste of the times required a certain brilliancy and rhetorical finish, and in order to meet this demand preaching must now seek these aids.

¹ *Hist. of Prea.*, p. 61.

Along with all that has been mentioned, we must remember that in the traditional and accepted educational system rhetorical studies occupied the chief place. If educated at all a man was educated in rhetoric. As lawyer, civilist, teacher, or man of letters, one must needs have had training in oratory. So when the schools were open to Christians, without persecution or social disfavor, there was opportunity for them to receive the customary oratorical training from the best teachers. And not a few who had been trained for other service entered the ministry. The six most notable preachers of the century¹—four in the East, and two in the West—had all received the best rhetorical culture of the schools; and there were hosts of others. Nor must we lose sight of the fact that in the audiences which heard the preaching of these times there were many who, as well as the preachers themselves, had been educated in the schools of rhetoric. A few cultured and critical hearers make their taste felt more than a multitude of the illiterate. Thus in different ways the education of the times lent its powerful aid to the other influences which combined to produce that pronounced heightening of oratorical power which we see in the preaching of the fourth century.

Besides these external influences, there had been at work in the preaching of the preceding age certain tendencies in the oratorical direction which came to their full development under the favorable circumstances of the new era. These only removed obstacles and encouraged and shaped progress. They could not have produced so great a growth and fruitage unless there had been life and movement within the sphere of preaching itself. The line of progress lay in the direction of the elaborate and structural discourse as distinguished from the informal conversational homily. There was a trend toward the artistic, scientific, oratorical form of address; and this must find its goal. The day for mere expository or hortatory talks as the dominant mode of presenting and urging the great truths of Christianity upon the attention of hearers was passing away. These should always remain as one of the forms of Christian discourse, but a law of internal devel-

¹ Basil, the two Gregories, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine.

opment was pushing religious oratory on to relatively as high a plane (considering the times) as the secular orations of the best class had occupied. Some of the elements of this tendency claim more specific notice.

Attention was called in our study of the earlier part of the period¹ to the gradual settling of the canon of Scripture. From the books enumerated by Eusebius as received by all, and even from those still disputed by some though received by many, we see that early in the fourth century the entire New Testament as we now have it had practically come into acceptance among the churches as being, along with the Old Testament, the inspired and authoritative Word of God. Under the lead of both the Alexandrian and the rising Antiochian schools the interpretation and application of Scripture had now become the main element of preaching; and especially under Origen's teaching and example had also become more of an orderly discourse. It was perfectly natural that this growth of homiletical exposition should go on into the great sermons which we have in the discourses of Chrysostom and others in the time now under review.

Another important element in the development of preaching was the fixing of doctrine. The great theological controversies and councils of the fourth and fifth centuries were symptomatic of a tendency toward doctrinal definition and uniformity which had been going on for a long time before. Schaff² remarks that "in the development of doctrine the Nicene and Post-Nicene age is second in productiveness and importance only to those of the apostles and the Reformation." So great and close is the connection between preaching and doctrine that the discussion and formulation of the latter must of necessity powerfully influence the former. And so in the times which we are now studying the quickened intellectual interest in some of the great fundamental truths of Christianity, the sharp discussions of them, and their final authoritative definition within accepted limits of orthodoxy, all exerted a mighty influence upon both the content and the form of preaching. And the influence was decidedly in the direction of a more elaborate and formal presentation of truth in discourse.

¹ *Supra*, p. 40 f. ² *Hist. of the Christian Ch.*, Vol. III., p. 6.

Still another factor was the culture of the ministry. We have already observed that in the Apologists and Theologians of the Ante-Nicene age a very intellectual and cultivated class of men had begun to come in increasing numbers to the standard of Christianity. The liberal policy of Constantine naturally increased still further this accession from the educated classes, and the previously mentioned facilities for education now held out to Christian teachers and preachers had also their part to play. Along with this the now well-established custom of having a special class of men for preachers must be remembered. So it is easy to see that the existence of a specially trained and well educated order of men from whom, for the most part, preachers were chosen tended to make preaching more and more artistic and oratorical. The more culture in the preachers, the more rhetorical the preaching, as a rule.

Thus in the providential ordering of events we see that a number of secondary causes combined to produce in the fourth century a remarkable outburst of Christian oratory. We cannot be surprised to find at this period one of the great historic culminations in the character and power of preaching.

2. CHARACTERISTICS OF FOURTH CENTURY PREACHING

We may now observe in a summary way the leading features of the preaching in this interesting period, though some of them have necessarily been already touched on in discussing the development of the sermon.

Among the outward features which distinguished the preaching of the fourth century we must take note of church buildings and other appliances for worship. In early times the places of worship were few and simple—upper rooms, schools, but sometimes also the synagogues, at least for preaching. In times of persecution the places were retired. The catacombs near Rome were resorted to, and no doubt secret places in other localities, as persecution might require. But in the intervals between these times of violence and distress church buildings had begun to be erected.

Under Diocletian's fearful persecution many of the buildings which had been erected in the calm after the

outburst under Decius were destroyed. So one of the noteworthy things in the era of toleration and patronage was the building of houses of worship. In this work the emperor Constantine himself set the example, and several churches were founded by his mother Helena. The form of structure was somewhat that of the *basilica*, or Roman court-room—a long rectangle with level floor provided with rows of seats. But there were modifications of this, which some think were adapted from the arrangements of private houses in which early worship was so often conducted. Besides the auditorium there were platforms or pulpits, and reading desks, called *ambones*; so that the material appliances for preaching were fairly well developed in this age.

Sundays and festival days were the usual times of preaching, but no doubt there were also special occasions of various sorts and frequency. From the earliest times a regular part of the Sunday worship had been the reading of the Scriptures with an exhortation following. But with the gradual fixing of the Christian year—especially the festivals of Christmas, Easter and Pentecost (Whitsuntide),—and with the increasing reverence paid to saints and martyrs on their days, the preaching on these special occasions assumed more and more importance. In later times, as we shall see, many of the series of sermons which were especially prized and preserved were these festival discourses.

The removal of the necessity of privacy, the building of large churches, the social prestige of Christianity, the fashion of attendance on worship, all contributed toward rendering congregations larger and more miscellaneous than in the former times. For a while heathen and heretics were kept in the outer court, but the people, presumably and nominally Christian, occupied the nave, *i.e.*, central part of the building, the men and women separated by partitions. As to posture the practice was perhaps not uniform, and may have varied even at the same place according to times and circumstances, but generally it appears that the people stood during preaching. The congregations were apparently not very orderly, for even the eloquent Chrysostom often rebukes them for inattention. They shifted about, sometimes

broke out into applause, and sometimes large numbers rushed from the church at the conclusion of the sermon, not waiting for the orderly closing of the service.

As was to be expected, both from natural development and from the new order of things, the worship in this period became more elaborate and ceremonious. Its contents were enriched, its order assumed greater fixity. The place of preaching was still just after the reading of the Scriptures, with sometimes perhaps a brief prayer between. The selection of the lesson, or portion of Scripture to be read, was not as yet fixed by any general rule for all the churches. The selection seems to have been left to the bishop,¹ but it is not improbable that in some churches there were at least the beginnings of a regular course of selections. The passage read was frequently used as the foundation of the sermon, or was referred to in the discourse; but just what connection there was between the selection of the Scripture and the previous preparation of the sermon—that is, as to which influenced the other—does not appear.

The growing tendency of earlier times, to restrict preaching as a public teaching office of the church to bishops and presbyters, may now be regarded as fixed and final custom. Whatever lay preaching continued was personal, informal and outside the regular work and worship of the churches. It is not improbable that heretics and minor sects retained a greater freedom in this respect; but this is matter of conjecture. The deacons were now regarded as an order of clergy, but their duties in worship were to read the Scriptures when appointed to do so, to assist the bishops in various ways, and to aid in the celebration of the ordinances and in the collection and distribution of the offerings. They were not regularly allowed to preach.² This was the special privilege and duty of the bishops, but was shared by the presbyters under episcopal regulation. The presbyters were ordained and appointed to their charges by the bishops, and likewise designated by them as preachers for special occasions. Thus Chrysostom served for several years as deacon at Antioch before he was designated by his bishop as leading preacher in the principal church of the city.

¹ See Schaff, Vol. III., p. 470.

² But this rule was not always rigidly enforced.

The contents of the sermon remained substantially what they had been at the close of the preceding age. As the Apostolic tradition had now faded, and the mediæval saints' legends had not yet arrived, the traditional is the least considerable element of fourth century preaching. The great work of Origen and his school, already so often mentioned, shows itself. Preaching is largely exposition of Scripture, often on a short text, sometimes continuous on whole books or parts of books, or on subjects. Doctrine also becomes now increasingly important as homiletical material; but with it, according to the personality of the preacher, is often mingled some speculation and philosophizing. The preacher's knowledge of life, of passing events, of literature, affords abundant illustration; and in some cases, notably with Basil and Gregory, illustration is derived from nature. The application is often close, direct, personal, and not infrequently very telling.

Between the structureless homily or exhortation of the early times, and the closely articulated, minutely analyzed sermon of the Scholastics and the Puritans of later ages, we find the fourth century discourse. Retaining the Scriptural motive and tone, and in large degree the familiarity, of the homily, and avoiding the tedious division and sub-division of the scholastic sermon, the *logos*, or oration, of this age is more assimilated to the classic models of oratory. It has form indeed, but its bony structure is not obtrusive. The delivery was extemporaneous. Some of the extant sermons were written by the preacher before or after delivery—more commonly perhaps the latter,—but many of them were reported by shorthand writers, with or without revision by the author. Thus Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia,¹ a contemporary and friend of Chrysostom, in one of his letters, speaks of certain sermons as not acknowledged by him as his own because they were hastily taken down by reporters and had not been submitted to him for correction; but others he had looked over and put into shape.

Of course the spirit and motive of these fourth century sermons varied with the individual preachers, as is ever the case. But even among the best preachers of the time

¹ See below, p. 97 f.

there is too often apparent the effort to strike and please by rhetorical display and to win applause by popular utterances. The taste of the age called for more oratorical exuberance than is fitting for the themes of sacred discourse, and the preachers did not rise far above their hearers in this respect. But with these drawbacks frankly noted, we cannot fail to see in many of these homilies the mastering desire of the preacher to glorify his Lord and to win the souls of his fellow men. For the Christian hearer there is constant instruction in the doctrines and duties of his religion, together with most earnest appeals and exhortations, rebukes or consolations, as the case might require.

That the life and thought of mankind were mightily and permanently influenced by the preaching of the fourth century there can be no doubt. As always, much of this influence is intangible and cannot be expressed in terms, but it was felt, then as now. The blessing of God was upon the now unknown as then unrecognized labors of many obscure men, as well as upon the known and applauded oratory of the great preachers. Souls were saved and edified, society influenced for good, and the better thoughts of men enriched and stimulated by the spoken Word in this impressive era of Christian history.

3. THE EASTERN PREACHERS

It is time to give our attention to some of the more important preachers¹ of this great period; and they naturally fall into an eastern and a western group. Among the eastern preachers, though not especially remarkable for his preaching, was the famous church historian, Eusebius (c. 260-340). He was bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, from 315 to his death in 340. He is chiefly known for his exceedingly valuable Church History and his extravagant eulogy on Constantine. He was probably born in Palestine, and was educated at Antioch and Cæsarea. He was a great student and well informed in history and literature. At one time the archbishopric of Antioch was offered him, but he declined the honor.

¹In the following discussions much help has been derived from the works, already named, of Paniel, Lentz and Rothe.

In the Arian controversy he tried to hold a middle course and was naturally distrusted by the extreme orthodox party. He accepted the Origenistic doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son, and therefore did not deny the proper deity of Christ, but he signed the Nicene Creed with some reluctance. He enjoyed the esteem of Constantine, and more than paid back his imperial patron in a well known and fulsome panegyric. As bishop he was a frequent preacher, but does not hold very high rank in this regard. A number of his homilies remain. They indicate knowledge of Scripture, acquaintance with other literature, a desire to do good, a fair amount of homiletical skill, a rather dry style, though characterized by the excess and over-ornamentation fashionable at the time.

There is another Eusebius, among the many who bore the name, who is worthy of mention as a preacher. This was the good bishop of Emesa, in Syria (d. c. 360), a friend and pupil of Eusebius of Cæsarea. He was a learned and highly esteemed man. Like his teacher he lay under some suspicion of Arian tendency in doctrine, but probably without justice. He also enjoyed the imperial favor. A number of homilies and some fragments ascribed to him remain, but many of these are of doubtful authenticity. From these and the mention of contemporary or later writers it is inferred that he was a preacher of more than ordinary force and eloquence as well as learning. It is much to his credit that in handling the Scriptures he departed from the extreme allegorical interpretation of Origen and his followers and approached nearer to the literal and grammatical exegesis of the Antiochian school.

The famous presbyter of Alexandria, the stout and successful opponent of Arius, the orthodox Athanasius (296-372), later bishop and often exiled, is one of the most interesting figures in church history. He is so celebrated as church leader, theologian, and defender of the Trinity against Arianism that his work as preacher attracts comparatively little attention. There are extant eighteen so-called homilies attributed to him, but their genuineness is seriously questioned, and their homiletical value is inconsiderable, though they show argumenta-

tive skill and force. From his standing and reputation, and from his genuine writings, we easily argue that his power as a preacher must have been more than respectable. Broadus¹ says of him, "His style of writing has directness, simplicity, and native force, a vigorous and manly eloquence, such as one seldom meets with in that age of stilted rhetoric."

Something over fifty homilies from this age are ascribed to one Macarius.² There were two preachers of this name, an elder and a younger, and it is not certain to which of them the greater part of the homilies belong, nor which to each. The authorities, however, mostly assign them to the elder man, and agree on ascribing them all to one author instead of dividing them between the two. Nor is it apparent whether any relationship existed between the two men. The elder (c. 300-375) was abbot of a convent in Egypt, and the character of the sermons agrees with that fact; for they are mostly sermons to monks inculcating the monastic virtues. Paniel³ thinks that if the author had led an active life among men he would have been a great preacher, for these homilies show warmth, earnestness, and an oratorical nature. Macarius also has an interest for us in being one of the earliest preachers in whom we find traces of that devout mysticism⁴ which was to form so prominent a characteristic of mediæval and later preaching. "His homilies have been appealed to by modern theopathic mystics as an authority for Quietism. He teaches perfectionist doctrine."⁵ Nebe says that Gottfried Arnold translated Macarius' homilies into German, and they were highly esteemed by the Pietists. But he does not agree with Vaughan that Macarius teaches perfection, absolute sinlessness, on earth.

A notable preacher of the age was Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315-386). Of the two noted fathers who bore the name of Cyril the earlier and better was born probably at or near Jerusalem about the year 315. When about

¹ *Hist. Prea.*, p. 63.

² Besides Paniel and others see especially Nebe, *Zur Geschichte der Predigt*, for a good discussion of Macarius. Bd. I., SS. 84 ff.

³ *Op. cit.*, S. 398 f.

⁴ Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*, Vol. I., p. 111.

⁵ Vaughan, *l. c.*; and Nebe, *op. cit.*, S. 86, *et passim*.

thirty years old he was appointed presbyter at Jerusalem, and was especially charged with the duty of instructing the catechumens in order to prepare them for baptism. An interesting and valuable series of these catechetical lectures remain. They are really homilies, and besides shedding some light on the views and practices of the time and place on the subject of baptism, they afford evidence of the preacher's art and spirit. Besides giving these lectures to candidates for baptism Cyril preached often to the congregation. One of his remaining sermons is on the healing of the impotent man at Bethesda. Paniel criticises it as full of digressions, parentheses, allegorizing—all indicating a youthful author. In 350 Cyril was elected bishop of Jerusalem. Owing to personal and doctrinal controversies he was twice deposed and reinstated. His condemnations were very probably unjust. Toward the close of his life he was greatly honored and loved as one who had suffered for the truth's sake.

Sometime during the fourth century, probably the latter part, there lived and labored at Amasea in Pontus a bishop called Asterius. Little or nothing is certainly known of his life. It is inferred from some allusions in his sermons that he lived in the time of the emperor Julian, but how long before or after that short reign (361-363) does not appear. It seems that he was educated at Antioch, but we cannot say whether he was born there or not. He had a teacher at Antioch, a Scythian, or Goth, who had been a slave but was then a freedman. This man was highly gifted and well read, and under his guidance Asterius studied the Greek classics and cultivated his style. He seems, as so many other good preachers have done, to have begun life as a lawyer, but was chosen bishop because of his piety and eloquence. He had the by-name of Philaretus, "the friend of virtue." We are fortunate in having ten of his sermons¹ which are accepted by critics as undoubtedly genuine, besides some fragments, and a larger number of doubtful authenticity. As to his preaching Paniel² remarks that

¹ Five of these have been well translated by Professor E. J. Goodspeed, of Chicago University, and published in a handy little volume, with an introduction by Dr. Galusha Anderson.

² *Op. cit.*, S. 567.

Chrysostom himself need not have been ashamed of some of these productions; and Broadus¹ says, "The subjects are moral and historical; he has fine descriptive powers; the style is marked by exquisite richness of expression, and not overwrought. . . . Some of his sermons could be preached in our churches with little alteration, and would be well received."

An exceedingly engaging personality of the Nicene age is that of the Syrian, Ephraim (c. 300-379), or as he is commonly known in ecclesiastical literature, Ephraem Syrus. He has been described as "the most distinguished divine orator and poet of the ancient Syrian church."² Owing to his hymns he was sometimes called "the Harp of the Holy Spirit." He was born near the beginning of the fourth century, in Mesopotamia, of heathen parents. His father was priest in a heathen temple, and on the youth's showing inclination to become a Christian, drove him from home. The boy went to the bishop of Nisibis, who took him in gladly and gave him Christian training. In company with this bishop he attended in his young manhood the great council of Nicæa, and became a thoroughgoing and orthodox Christian. Settling in Edessa in Syria about the year 363 he lived as a hermit in a cave, earnestly studying, and preaching to his fellow monks. Though he was not very well acquainted with Greek he managed to have an interview with Basil, the famous bishop and preacher of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, whom he visited and by whom he was ordained a deacon. He later evaded being made a bishop by playing David's rôle at Gath and feigning himself mad. But though he declined ecclesiastical office beyond that of deacon he was a theologian, writer, poet, and also a preacher of great popularity and power. He was faithful in his benevolent ministrations to the sick, and is said to have died as a result of his self-denying labors during the prevalence of the plague.

In his preaching and writings he used his native Syrian tongue. A large number of his homilies remain, but a

¹ *Hist. Prea.*, p. 66.

² Schaff, *op. cit.*, III., p. 953, from whom the account in the text is chiefly derived. See also several of Ephraem's homilies in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. XIII., p. 305 ff.

larger number have of course passed away. Photius says that he composed more than a thousand homilies. Some are expository, some controversial. "They evince a considerable degree of popular eloquence; they are full of pathos, exclamations, apostrophes, antitheses, illustrations, severe rebuke, and sweet comfort, according to the subject; but are also full of exaggerations, bombast, prolixity, and the superstitions of his age."¹

Far to the North, a famous contemporary of Ephraem's, Ulfilas (313-383), the so-called apostle of the Goths, should not be forgotten.² It is said that he came of a Cappadocian family who had been captured by the Goths in one of their raids. But he was born among the barbarians and his name is the familiar Teutonic "Wolf." His parents taught him Greek and Christianity from childhood, and thus was he providentially fitted for his mission among his people. In his thirtieth year he was ordained a bishop, and worked with great zeal for the conversion of the Goths beyond the Danube. But persecution drove him and some of his converts southward, and he obtained permission from the emperor Constantine in 350 to cross over into the imperial dominions. This was twenty-five years ahead of the famous migration permitted by Valens. Here for thirty-three years Ulfilas lived, laboring among the Goths on both sides of the river as far as he could. He was Arian in doctrine, and that accounts for the prevalence of that view among the Goths.

Ulfilas was a faithful, devoted, earnest man, and a diligent bishop. He therefore must have preached much, but we have no sermons from him whereby to judge of his methods and powers as a preacher. Regretting his Arianism, we should yet honor his fidelity and zeal, and never forget his inestimable service of translating the New Testament into Gothic. This is the earliest monument of Teutonic literature, and probably the first translation of the Scriptures made into a barbarous tongue.

More eminent than those of whom we have been thinking was a renowned trio of preachers from the highlands of Cappadocia. On the hardy people of this region the Greeks had imprinted deeply and lastingly their civiliza-

¹ Schaff, *l. c.*

² Article in *Herzog-Plitt*, Bd. 16, S. 146.

tion and culture. They are described as a rough and vigorous mountain race, fierce and treacherous; but they have given to history some important characters, among whom were none more famous than the three great preachers and divines who adorned Cappadocia during the fourth century. In the address of the First Epistle of Peter, Cappadocia is mentioned as one of the countries in which lived the Christians to whom that general letter was written. With this early start it is not unlikely that the Christians greatly multiplied in the region, and that by the fourth century (as seems clearly to be the case) there were great numbers of them. The principal city, Mazaca, renamed Cæsarea after the Roman occupation, was at this time the populous and flourishing metropolis of all that region. It was situated on a beautiful stream, with Mt. Argæus, 13,000 feet, rising sheer and grand near by.

The period covered by the lives of Basil, his younger brother Gregory, and their friend Gregory of Nazianzus, was one of tumult and unrest in church and state. The Christians of Cappadocia, as indeed in all the East, were torn asunder by the Arian controversy; and there was serious trouble during all this time, no matter which party, according to the fluctuations of imperial favor, might be filling the offices. The bishopric of Cæsarea was of metropolitan rank, and on Basil's elevation to it the province contained fifty subordinate bishoprics.

The two families from which these three men sprang were of high social standing, wealth, and lofty Christian character. The parents of Basil and the younger Gregory were Basil, a rhetorician and lawyer of Neo-Cæsarea in Pontus, and Emmelia, a Christian lady of excellent family from Cæsarea in Cappadocia. The paternal grandmother, Macrina of Pontus, was a noble Christian woman. The family seem to have lived partly at Pontus and partly at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, where Basil (and probably Gregory too) was born. With so pious a grandmother—a devoted admirer of Gregory Thaumaturgus, the bishop and saint of Pontus in the preceding generation—and mother, it is not strange that this admirable family was eminent for piety. Three bishops, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Peter of Sebaste, came from

among the sons, and there was also a distinguished lawyer among them. Macrina, the saintly sister, to whom both Basil and Gregory owed so much, never married but led the monastic life, and was highly esteemed as a Christian woman of excellent gifts and lovely character.

Likewise the family of Gregory Nazianzen was of good social and religious standing. The father had an estate at a little village called Arianzus near to the more important town of Nazianzus from which this Gregory has his surname. Gregory's father was a Christian, but in early life belonged to an obscure sect called the Hypsistarians, from which he was brought over to the orthodox faith by the influence and entreaties of his pious and devoted wife, Nonna. This godly woman, like Anthusa and Monica in her own age, and many a good Christian mother since, consecrated her son to God and brought him up from childhood "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." The father—for that was long before celibacy became a rigid rule—was bishop of Nazianzus for many years, dying at an advanced age in 374. There was also a sister, Gorgonia, and a brother, Cæsar, who became a noted physician at Constantinople.

Turning now to consider in more detail the individuals of this justly famous group we properly begin with Basil (329-379), afterwards called the Great.¹ Born at Cæsarea in Cappadocia in 329, his early education was attended to by his father, a well-known rhetorician. During his childhood the family seems to have resided in Pontus, for he came thence in his youth back to Cæsarea to go to school. Here he first met Gregory of Nazianzus, who subsequently became his nearest friend through life. After this he went to Constantinople, where he enjoyed the instructions of Libanius, who was later at Antioch the famous teacher of John Chrysostom. About the year 350 or later Basil went to Athens to complete his education. Here he found Gregory of Nazianzus, who had preceded him. While here the two young men formed an intimate and affectionate friendship which with only one temporary interruption, lasted through life. They were congenial spirits in very many ways, and their

¹Translations of his works in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VIII.

beautiful and pure attachment is not strange. It is especially worthy of note that amid the temptations and dissipations for which college towns have ever been noted, these two, though not yet committed fully to the Christian life, preserved their purity, and thus honored their Christian nurture.

With longings already stirred for a deeper Christian experience, and with inclinations toward asceticism, Basil left Athens well educated and prepared for the work of life. About this time his father died and he began the practice of law and the teaching of rhetoric at Cæsarea. But though successful and admired, he did not put his whole heart into the work. More and more he was drawn toward the monastic life. He took a journey into Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, studying monastic institutions. On his return he gave up the law, divided his wealth among the poor, and retired to Pontus. His widowed mother and his sister Macrina had already gone thither and were living in a cloister with other women of like mind. Near them Basil found a spot to his liking where he could form with others a monastery. In a letter to Gregory Nazianzen he describes the place and urges his friend to join him in this quiet retreat of piety and study. Gregory came, as we shall see, but did not remain long.

From this quiet cloister Basil was, much against his inclinations, called forth to active service, and was made a presbyter at Cæsarea in Cappadocia in 364. He preached often and with great success. In 370 he was elevated to the metropolitan bishopric of Cæsarea. This made him church ruler over a province containing fifty subordinate bishoprics. He strenuously set himself to the work of his charge, and was especially active against Arianism, endeavoring to fill the places with bishops of the orthodox party. To this end he appointed his brother Gregory bishop of Nyssa, and his friend Gregory bishop of Sasima. These were obscure towns, and Sasima was very displeasing to Gregory, who was hurt with his friend for sending him to such a place. The emperor Valens, being Arian in opinions, was minded to depose Basil, but for some reason did not.

Besides his cares of administration and frequent

preaching Basil was active in benevolence. It was said of him that "only the poor knew how great were the revenues of his bishopric." He founded a hospital—one of the first, if not the very first in Christian history—for the care of the indigent sick, chiefly lepers, and often ministered to them in person. A feeble frame, severe asceticism, and arduous labors tell the story of a life prematurely worn out, and he died in 379 in his fiftieth year. He was greatly beloved in life and deeply lamented in death. His funeral was attended by an immense concourse and was a remarkable demonstration of popular regard.

As a preacher Basil had native oratorical gifts, a very suitable and thorough education, and the inspiring demands of place and age. Besides all this he was a truly noble Christian character, earnestly intent on doing good, and constantly in touch with men in administering his great office. His preaching attracted large crowds and pleased as well as helped both the cultured few and the uncultured many. He sometimes preached short sermons at the hour of noonday rest, and "artisans, laborers, silk-spinners would crowd into the church to listen to the discourse." Of his much praised *Hexaëmeron*—a series of discourses on the six days of creation—it has been said, "The simplest could comprehend them, while the wisest admired them." His clear and often elegant style, though marred now and then with the overdone exuberance of the place and time, showed the traces of his education and taste. His knowledge of human nature and power of illustration were great. Schaff has done well to call attention to his good use of illustration and description from nature. This was something new, for even the great classic orators were deficient in this respect. Basil's use of Scripture was faulty with the strained allegorizing of the Alexandrian school, but it is reverent and telling. Broadus¹ speaks in especial commendation of his treatment of moral subjects and says, "Amid all the admirable temperance literature of our own age, I have seen no more just and vivid exhibition of many of the evils of drunkenness than is given by Basil in his sermon on that subject." Upon the whole

¹ *Hist. Prea.*, p. 69.

we may say that Basil justly won the respect and reputation which he enjoyed in life, and that posterity has accepted and confirmed the verdict of his own age by giving him a secure place among the great preachers of all time.

Among all the famous Gregories of Church History hardly one better deserves his fame than he of Nazianzus in Cappadocia.¹ Enough has already been told of his parents and of his pious childhood. In youth, up to his thirtieth year when he left Athens, he received the best education his time afforded in schools at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, at Cæsarea in Palestine, at Alexandria—where he knew and revered the great Athanasius—and lastly at Athens, where he remained longer than his friend Basil, and where he was urged, on completing his studies, to remain and set up a school. This, however, he declined to do, and returned home by way of Constantinople, where he visited his brother Cæsarius the physician, whom he induced to go on home with him to see their parents. Filial as well as religious interest prompted this action. Cæsarius, however, though a Christian, did not receive baptism at this time, but Gregory was baptized by his father on this visit home and remained there some time assisting his father in various ways—with his theological learning in the church affairs, and with his practical sense in the management of the estate at Arianzus. His heart, however, was deeply moved toward the monastic life, and on the invitation of Basil he joined his friend at the secluded place in Pontus, as already related. He could not have remained here many months, for in 361 on another visit home he was, without his consent, but with the approval and in the presence of the congregation, ordained a presbyter by his father. This sudden and unexpected elevation to ecclesiastical office was not to his liking, and he ran away back to Pontus and Basil. But his sense of duty overcame his irritation and his preferences, and after awhile he returned home once more and was his father's assistant (in fact, though perhaps not by regular official appointment) until the old man's death in 374. Once during this time he was again in retirement for a season; and these fluctuations between

¹ *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VII.

the active and retired life were frequent and characteristic. Duty, with perhaps a trace of ambition, drove him to the one, but taste and temper inclined him to the other. He once in his father's presence explained to the congregation this conflict in his mind between his love of solitude and his deference to the calls of public duty.

Within this period of his life also occurred the straining of his friendship with Basil. One way in which that great prelate undertook to drive out Arianism from his province was to appoint his friends to bishoprics, and to make bishoprics even in small places where there was special need. One of these insignificant places was Sasima, a wretched cross-roads town, very undesirable in every way and territorially in dispute between Basil and his rival Arian neighbor, the metropolitan of Tyana. To this miserable place Gregory was appointed by his friend. Whether some desire to assert his authority and to discipline the ambition of Gregory may have weighed with the main motive of Basil in making this unwise and somewhat ungenerous appointment we may not certainly say. Gregory, while perhaps he did not much care for great place in itself, had enough both of pride and affection to be deeply wounded at the slight thus put upon him by his dearest friend; and while it appears that he allowed himself to be consecrated as bishop it also seems that he never actually took up his official residence at Sasima. He continued to assist his father at Nazianzus, and on the older man's death in 374 it is probable—though the matter is not perfectly clear—that he exercised the office of bishop there. But whether this relation was official or only tolerated it does not appear to have continued long, for soon Gregory was in retirement again, this time at or near Seleucia in Isauria. Here in 379 the news of Basil's death came to him. Long before, no doubt, the temporary breach had been healed and a good understanding resumed between the two. On getting the news Gregory wrote to Gregory of Nyssa a touching and beautiful letter which remains, and some time later, upon invitation of the church at Cæsarea, he delivered his famous eulogy on Basil.¹ This, though

¹ Translation of portions of it in Fish, *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*, I., p. 67 ff.

naturally overdone, is an eloquent and feeling tribute, perhaps the best remaining specimen of the orator's genius.

In this same year, 379, Gregory was called to the care of the little depressed and scattered church of orthodox Christians at Constantinople. Under Valens Arianism had been triumphant at the capital, and orthodoxy had suffered. In some way this little flock turned to the eloquent Nazianzen, and he was urged by many of his brethren to undertake the restoration of orthodoxy at the imperial city. He went, and here within two years did the great work of his life. His success in drawing congregations, building up the church, and giving to the Athanasian doctrine once again respectability and power at one of the world's capitals, is one of the most distinct and notable triumphs in the history of preaching. It is true that the reaction from Arianism under the earnestly orthodox emperor Theodosius aided the restoration, but that enlightened monarch recognized the services of the preacher and appointed him to the great Church of the Apostles, afterwards made famous by the eloquence of Chrysostom. This appointment to the archbishopric was not regular, as Gregory was officially still entangled with his wretched bishopric of Sasima, or his assistant-bishopric of Nazianzus, or both; and so the action of a synod was needed to disentangle the affair and give him the promotion in regular official form. The great Council of Constantinople in 381, called by the emperor still further to pass on the doctrine of the Person of Christ, gave the needed opportunity. By this council Gregory was formally declared archbishop of Constantinople, and was inaugurated with great pomp. But there was still dissatisfaction and much murmuring, doubtless emphasized by personal reasons, and Gregory, weary of contention and longing once more for retirement, resigned before the year was out. On leaving he preached a notable farewell sermon in which he freed his mind as to the causes of his withdrawal.

He now returned to his old home at Arianzus, where he busied himself with the care of his estate, his correspondence, his writings, and to some extent, as adviser, with the affairs of the church at Nazianzus. Thus oc-

cupied he spent his last years and died probably about 390.

Gregory Nazianzen holds a high and firm place among the world's great preachers. Small of stature and unprepossessing in appearance, he had no majestic presence to help out the flash and force of his oratorical genius. He was sensitive, vain, ambitious, yet struggling with these and other infirmities ever toward the better things in character and usefulness. The imaginative, delicate, poetic turn of his mind united with his deep religious feeling and firmness of doctrinal belief, and with his admirable culture, to produce a Christian orator of the first rank. Many specimens of his eloquence remain. They are marred by the weaknesses of the man, the oriental extravagance of his race, the bad taste and tawdry rhetoric of the age; but in spite of all this their excellences are marked. Bishop W. Boyd Carpenter¹ says of him: "Well acquainted with the sacred Scriptures, he could reason forcibly and expound clearly, and his lively imagination contributed, with his literary culture, to give a charm and beauty to his sermons." And Ullman, quoted by Carpenter, speaks of "the fertility of his imagination, his fire and strength, his rapidity and compactness of thought, his heartiness and truth of feeling, and his occasional loftiness of flight."

Younger by some years than his great brother, Basil, and the third son in the family, was Gregory (c. 335-395) afterwards named from his bishopric at Nyssa.² Not much is known of his early life and training. He does not seem to have had (perhaps did not desire) such thorough education as Basil. Yet it is evident from his works that he too was highly cultivated. No doubt his father instructed him, and he himself speaks in affectionate and grateful terms of his debt for learning as well as other things to his brother Basil and his sister Macrina. He had some inclination toward the ministry of the church, and became in early life an *anagnostes*, or reader, in the congregation, probably at Cæsarea. But he quitted this office and became a rhetorician. This was considered a great lapse, and he was warmly recalled to

¹ *Clergyman's Magazine*, Vol. I., p. 235.

² Translations in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V.

duty by some letters (still extant) from Gregory Nazianzen. He gave up his worldly ambitions and though married—when is not known—went into a retired life for a while.

After Basil became metropolitan bishop of Cæsarea he appointed Gregory to the little bishopric of Nyssa, saying that he preferred the place should get fame from his brother rather than his brother from the place. And it was a prophecy, for but for the man the town would long ago have been forgotten. This Gregory did not take his appointment as did the Nazianzen. He was reluctant to take the office—as was the accepted custom—but made no objection to the place, and put himself into his work with zeal. His abilities as a speaker and debater against Arianism were exactly what Basil wanted at that place and time. He was driven, in 376, from his bishopric by the agents of the imperial government, and an Arian was put in his place. But after two years of retirement, on the death of Valens and the revocation by Gratian of decrees of banishment against Athanasians, he came triumphantly back. Soon afflictions came fast upon him in the death of Basil, of Macrina, and others of his family, and later (c. 384) in that of his good wife, appropriately named Theosebia.

In 381 Gregory attended the Council of Constantinople, and is reasonably supposed to have had great influence in framing the creed adopted by that body. He appears to have made several subsequent visits to Constantinople, and to have visited by official appointment several countries in the interests of peace and orthodoxy. He probably lived till the year 395.

As a writer and preacher Gregory Nyssen was philosophic in mind and of strong speculative bent. He reminds us strongly of Origen both in this respect and in the excessive allegorizing of his interpretation of Scripture. He was a frequent preacher, and a number of his homilies remain. Paniel¹ thus describes him: "His eminent oratorical talent, not put in the shade by Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Asterius, would yet be far worthier of respect if the Nyssen had held more in check his desire for clever comparisons, his immoderate allegor-

¹ *Op. cit.*, S. 543.

izing, his inclination to glittering rhetorical flourishes, his exaggerations, digressions and prolixity."

These three friends and eminent Christian leaders and thinkers, often called "the Cappadocian Cloverleaf," are an interesting study in the history of the church and of preaching. Basil was the most restrained—or rather the least extravagant—of the three. His was the better taste, the more orderly arrangement. Gregory Nazianzen was the most impulsive and ardent—nervous, petulant, poetic. Gregory Nyssen was the most metaphysical and speculative—keen and profound in thought. Basil was the man of affairs, the prelate, the manager; Gregory Nazianzen was the man of feeling, the poet, the orator; Gregory Nyssen was the man of thought, the philosopher, the logician. All were great preachers, each a striking example of his kind.

John of Antioch (347-407), later named Chrysostom, the Golden Mouth, was the greatest of the old Greek preachers.¹ He was born at Antioch in 345 or 347, more probably the latter date. His father died while he was yet a little child, leaving his mother a widow at twenty years of age. She was a rare woman—young, good looking, cultured, of excellent family and standing, and well-to-do. Suitors were many and pressing, and it is hinted that the emperor wished her to be married to one of his officers. But she refused all offers of marriage and devoted herself to bringing up her boy. She gave him the best educational training that the time and place afforded. At home she taught him the religious life, and for his mental culture she selected the best teachers. At one time he was under the care of the famed Libanius, who had also taught Basil, and that great rhetorician is said to have wished John to be his successor—if the Christians had not taken him! Libanius is also reported to have

¹ The literature on Chrysostom is of course very rich in amount and value. Besides all the works on the history hitherto quoted, and others, the admirable *Life* by W. R. W. Stephens is especially worthy of mention. Of the many editions of his works, original and translations, there is no need here to take account. The *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* series contains the most valuable. Of these the volume of the *Homilies on Philippians* is edited with a very instructive and appreciative introduction by Dr. John A. Broadus. For a good single sermon, see *Fish Masterpieces*, I., p. 83 ff.

remarked, when he heard of Anthusa's devotion to John, "What women these Christians have!"

John was educated for the law, and actually began the practice of it. A great career seemed to open before him, but for the pure and earnest young man the corruptions of that profession and of the worldly life about him were too bad to be endured. He gave up his business and prospects and was on the point of going into a monastery, but his mother's persuasion induced him to postpone this for a while, as it would leave her lonely.¹ He led a very ascetic life at home, and later (presumably after his mother's death) he entered a monastery near Antioch where, under the teaching of Diodorus, he remained for several years and carefully studied the Scriptures.

In the year 381 he was called forth from this retreat by his bishop and ordained a deacon at Antioch. For four or five years he exercised this subordinate office, which gave him much contact with the people—both rich and poor—and acquaintance with practical church affairs. But his great gift of speech deserved recognition and the world needed the exercise of it, so the bishop of Antioch appointed him in 386 to be presbyter and chief preacher in the leading church of his native city. Here he exercised his brilliant ministry for about twelve years. He soon became the most popular preacher of the city and of the age. His fame spread far and wide. During this time there was a serious sedition at Antioch over the taxes, and the mob in a frenzy mutilated the statues of the emperor, the empress, and their sons. Theodosius, though a Christian, had a fierce temper which sometimes broke all bounds; and the people of Antioch on reflection knew that they had much to fear from the emperor's wrath. They sent a deputation headed by the aged bishop Flavian to Constantinople to apologize for the affront and sue for imperial clemency. In this interval of popular suspense Chrysostom delivered the famous series of twenty-one homilies "On the Statues," which have come down to us. The sermons, so opportune and earnest, had a great effect, and remain as admirable specimens of his genius.

¹Chrysostom himself gives a feeling account of this interview in his treatise *On the Priesthood*, Bk. II., Ch. 2.

Stephens, in his valuable *Life of Chrysostom*, gives the following vivid account of the occasion: "During the absence of Flavian all the powers of Chrysostom as an orator, a pastor, and a citizen were called forth in attempting to calm the fears and revive the deeply dejected spirits of the people. Perseveringly did he discharge this anxious and laborious task; almost every day for twenty-two days that small figure was to be seen either sitting in the *ambo*, from which he sometimes preached on account of his diminutive stature, or standing on the steps of the altar, the preacher's usual place; and day after day the crowds increased which came to listen to the stream of golden eloquence which he poured forth. With all the versatility of a consummate artist he moved from point to point. Sometimes a picture of the city's agony melted his hearers to tears, and then again he struck the note of encouragement, and revived their spirits by bidding them take comfort from the well-known clemency of the emperor, the probable success of the mission of Flavian, and above all from trust in God."

A passage from the second homily illustrates the preacher's manner: "The gay and noisy city, where once the busy people hummed like bees around their hive, was petrified by fear into the most dismal silence and desolation; the wealthier inhabitants had fled into the country, those who remained shut themselves up in their houses, as if the town had been in a state of siege. If any one ventured into the market-place, where once the multitude poured along like the stream of a mighty river, the pitiable sight of two or three cowering dejected creatures in the midst of solitude soon drove them home again. The sun itself seemed to veil its rays as if in mourning. The words of the prophet were fulfilled. 'Their sun shall go down at noon, and their earth shall be darkened in a clear day' (Amos. 8:9). Now they might cry, 'Send to the mourning women, and let them come, and send for cunning women that they may come' (Jer. 9:17). Ye hills and mountains! take up a wailing; let us invite all creation to commiserate our woes, for this great city, this capital of Eastern cities, is in danger of being destroyed out of the midst of the earth, and there is no man to help her, for the emperor, who has no equal

among men, has been insulted; therefore let us take refuge with the King who is above, and summon him to our aid."

The homilies, however, were not only eloquent, but most timely and effective, so that thousands were by their means brought to better thoughts. The preacher bore down upon the vices and sins which marred the city; he complained that the people feared the wrath of the emperor more than the wrath of God, and dreaded death more than sin. Altogether these Statue Homilies are one of the most remarkable series of discourses in the literature of the pulpit. With them Chrysostom's fame and power reached their height in the city of his birth. But he was not to spend his life there.

After some years the archbishopric of Constantinople fell vacant, and there was a scramble of eager aspirants for the place. Among these was Theophilus, the unscrupulous and intriguing archbishop of Alexandria. At this time the weak emperor Arcadius, unworthy successor in the East of his great father Theodosius, was under the influence of one of the meanest of his ministers, the infamous Eutropius. This man determined to disappoint all the schemers and bring from Antioch the eloquent John and make him archbishop at the capital. Knowing that both John and the people of Antioch would resist this move, Eutropius resorted to stratagem and force to accomplish his purpose. The preacher was, innocently on his part, persuaded to come outside the city walls for the ostensible purpose of worshipping at some shrine. He was seized by a band of soldiers in waiting and hurried off to Constantinople, where, with the requisite formalities, he was made archbishop and leading preacher at the great Church of the Apostles!—an office which Gregory Nazianzen had peevishly resigned about eighteen years before this time.

Here for a little over six years (397-404) the pure and devoted archbishop administered with rare fidelity and courage his great trust, and the eloquent preacher poured forth the intense and lofty oratory which has filled the world with his fame. He lived the life of an ascetic, using the large revenues of his office in alms and other pious works. He disciplined his venal and corrupt in-

ferior clergy with an unsparing hand, and gave attention without personal ambition to the details of his exacting and responsible office. He concerned himself with benevolences, with missions, with affairs of general interest. In his eloquent preaching he was no time-server, but rebuked without fear or favor all classes and conditions of men. His plainness of speech gave great offence to the beautiful and imperious Eudoxia, the worldly consort of Arcadius. This hatred of the empress and the envy and anger of many of the clergy were the causes of Chrysostom's deposition and banishment.

Under the lead of the infamous Theophilus of Alexandria, and no doubt at Eudoxia's instigation, a synod was hastily called at The Oak, a suburb of Chalcedon across the strait, to consider charges against the archbishop. A formidable list of charges was made out—about forty in number. Many of them were trivial, most of them utterly false, some with just enough show of truth to make them pass—with exaggerations and perversions—for the truth. Under such circumstances Chrysostom's condemnation was a foregone conclusion. He was deposed by a regularly convened and therefore formally legal synod of the church, and was turned over to the government for punishment. The empress saw to that, and an imperial decree of banishment was forthwith served upon the bishop by the military arm of the government. He was escorted across the strait and his enemies seemed successful. But news of his deposition and hasty banishment flew through the city—the people were roused—they gathered in crowds—they shouted, "Give us back our bishop," "We will have our bishop," "Better let the sun cease to shine than stop that golden mouth!" In the midst of the popular uproar an earthquake came. The terrified empress quailed, the emperor gave way, Theophilus took to flight, and orders were given to bring the beloved preacher back. But this could not last. The sentence was not revoked, nor the enmity appeased. Finally, rather than be a source of schism in the church and of tumult in the empire the good and wise man decided to accept voluntarily his condemnation with an appeal to a future general council. (This, it is almost needless to say, was never called.) In order to avoid

popular disturbance he left his mule hitched in the usual place near the church, and gave himself up privately through the back way to the guard, who secretly conveyed him across the Bosphorus.

From his place of exile—Cucusus, in the mountains near the border between Cappadocia and Armenia—he kept up correspondence with his friends, continued to care for his flock, his benevolences, his missions; and was much sought in counsel. As he thus continued to be too popular and influential for his enemies, the authorities determined to change the place of his banishment to an inaccessible little town on the Black Sea. On the way thither his feeble frame, worn out with lifelong asceticism and these new hardships, gave way. He died in a little church by the roadside near Comana¹ in Pontus, repeating his favorite phrase, “Glory to God for all things.”

Judged by his character, by his sermons as we have them, and by his work and influence, John Chrysostom has been always and with singular agreement among critics esteemed one of the greatest preachers of all time. Even the cold and sneering Gibbon gives a long account of Chrysostom, and though not doing the saint and preacher justice, is compelled by the facts to accord him high praise. Milton in his *Areopagitica*, speaking of the comedies of Aristophanes, says, “Holy Chrysostom, as is reported, nightly studied so much the same author, and had the art to cleanse a scurrilous vehemence into the style of a rousing sermon.” Indeed nearly all references in history and literature recognize the easy pre-eminence of the man. Some indeed give him, all things considered, the very first place after the Apostles. What were some of the principal elements of his success?

To begin with he had excellent advantages. God had endowed him with rich natural gifts of mind and heart—he had a great intellect, and the germs of a noble nature. Then he had the devoted and intelligent care of a pious and lovely mother. His liberal education and early work at the profession of the law developed his mind and gave him knowledge of the world. His retired life of prayer and study strengthened his spiritual

¹It is an interesting fact that near this very spot many centuries later (1812) died the devoted missionary, Henry Martyn.

life and made him master of the Scriptures. Then he worked as deacon for four years in the great city of Antioch, coming in daily contact with the people and with ecclesiastical details. So, when, a man of nearly forty years, he was called to be chief preacher at Antioch he had behind him a wonderfully varied and complete preparation for his work.

Nor must we lose sight of the things that helped him in the work. He had great places to fill, and inspiring audiences to preach to, both at Antioch and Constantinople. He had at his command one of the greatest languages for oratorical purposes that has ever been spoken by man. Nor must we omit the important fact that the largeness of his mind and breadth of his sympathies in other lines of work helped him in the pulpit. His work with and for the people, his benevolent and missionary enterprises, and his administrative labors, so far from hindering his preaching, made it larger in mould, more popular in effect. He was no bookish recluse, but a man of the people. Their life and souls were his to know and direct.

Chrysostom's faults as a preacher were neither few nor little. As great a man as he will have great faults as well as great excellences. His best work is marred by the oriental intensity and exaggeration, in feeling, in thought, in language. The overmuch was his snare. In theology, while he was true to the Athanasian orthodoxy, he did not escape the errors of his age and race. He overpraises alms, celibacy, monasticism, as meritorious works. His view of sin and its remedy is more moral than evangelical. Strong tendency toward the worship of Mary and the saints appears. Also there is the sacerdotal view of the ordinances. In brief he did not rise above the doctrinal errors current in his day. In his preaching itself there is often loose and forced interpretation of Scripture. Sometimes he doesn't take a text at all, and almost never confines himself to it. While he does not allegorize after the Origenistic fashion, he does not mind twisting a passage to fit his homiletical needs. In the structure of his discourses he is often loose, fond of digressions and sallies, sometimes getting back to his point and sometimes not. In style he is often too familiar, too prolix and repetitious.

But serious as such faults are, they serve in a case like his to set off great virtues, and also to check the undue admiration we may be disposed to indulge. John Chrysostom had from early childhood a deep, sincere, and pure religious character. Piety, earnestness, sincerity, and self-sacrifice were realities with him. Splendid courage, even if it did sometimes approach bravado, was his. He feared not empress, nor people, nor his evil-minded brethren. He spoke the truth no matter whom it might hit. Fidelity to duty as he saw it animated him in all his work. He, too, was one who wore himself out for his Master.

On the basis of such a character as this the more properly oratorical virtues naturally and safely rested. The nameless oratorical instinct—the way to say here and now the thing that ought to be said, the acute readiness to turn the hap of the moment to account—this was his. Command of language, wealth of material, abundance and fitness of illustration, fine imaginative and descriptive powers—these, too, were his. Add to all this a wonderful knowledge of the Bible and of human nature and of the art of applying the teachings of one to the needs of the other, and the splendid equipment of a live and mighty preacher stands confessed. Students of his sermons and of his life unite in a chorus of well deserved praise of his oratory, but none has said a finer thing of him than his pupil and friend, John Cassian:¹ “He kindled his zeal in the bosom of his Redeemer.”

4. THE WESTERN PREACHERS

The attractive characters and work of the great Greek preachers of the fourth century have detained us perhaps too long from their lesser but still important Latin contemporaries. But these may be more briefly presented, because they are fewer and less worthy of study than the Eastern preachers whom they imitated. The singular dependence of the Latin mind upon the Greek for ideas and for culture is as well illustrated in the history of preaching as in that of other literature. Not even the great Augustine, any more than the great Cicero before

¹ Quoted by W. Boyd Carpenter, *Clerg. Mag.*, Vol. I., p. 97.

him, was free from this unhealthy dependence; and if not these greater minds, how much less the smaller ones! Hence in passing from the blooming time of Greek Christian preaching in the fourth century to the Latin preaching of the same period we feel a distinct drop. Yet the native vigor and intense practical turn of the Latin genius asserted themselves, and did not fail to give even to the imitative work of the Western preachers some tinge of original power. This was especially true of Augustine, the only really great preacher among them, but shows itself to some extent in the weaker men who preceded him. Augustine therefore represents the culmination of early Latin preaching, and our present survey will appropriately close with him. But we must also give some attention to the great bishop of Milan, Ambrose, and before him to a group of the earlier preachers of less fame.

Among the Latin preachers who come between Cyprian and Ambrose one of the most important was Hilary (d. 368), the highly esteemed bishop of Poitiers.¹ He was born toward the end of the third century at the place which his own work has made somewhat known in church annals, but which the famous victory of the Black Prince a thousand years later (1356) has celebrated in the history of England. Pictavium, in Aquitania, a province of southern Gaul, known in modern times as Poitiers, was the scene of Hilary's birth and labors. He was of good family and apparently well-to-do. His parents may have been Christian, but this is uncertain. He had good educational opportunities, but was a little slow at first in his mental progress. But by hard work he secured good learning. He studied at Rome and in Greece. When he was baptized, or how long before baptism he had been a Christian we do not know; but as delay in baptism was then common, his elevation to the episcopate in his native town shortly after his baptism does not prove a late conversion. His piety and abilities had long been recognized, and somewhere between 350 and 355, because of his learning, his pure life, his zeal, he was called to the bishopric of Poitiers. He had been married, probably in

¹ See Paniel, S. 697 ff., and the biography and works of Hilary in Migne's *Latin Patrology*, tom. 9, 10.

early life, to an excellent woman; but his married state did not hinder his election, as celibacy, though regarded as preferable, was not at this period enforced. He had a daughter Abra, or Apra, to whom he wrote when absent once a curious letter, still preserved, in which he urges her to remain unmarried, advises her on some religious matters, and sends her a morning and an evening hymn. The latter is lost, but the other is the beautiful one beginning *Lucis largitor splendide*, one of the treasures of ancient Christian hymnody.¹ For his zeal against Arianism he suffered banishment (c. 356-361) under the emperor Constantius. During his exile, in Phrygia, he wrote his treatise in twelve books on the Trinity, besides other writings. He was recalled, and then again banished, and seems to have ended his life in retirement about the year 368.

He was sound in the faith, an honest and bold believer in the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity before it had been formulated in the Nicene creed. He gladly accepted that instrument, and was a lifelong opponent of Arianism. As to baptism he held the view then prevalent that it was necessary to salvation, but on condition of repentance and faith. He believed in a strict church discipline and was diligent in seeking to win men to the faith in Christ.

In regard to his preaching not much is to be said. The Benedictine editor² of his works says that Hilary expounded the Gospel of Matthew to the people, and that he says of himself, "What he believed he preached, through the ministry of the ordained priesthood, to others; and exercised his calling for the salvation of the people." Jerome speaks favorably of his eloquence, comparing it to the flow of the river Rhone. On this Paniel shrewdly remarks that the Rhone is a rather muddy torrent! No sermons as such remain. But there are a number of treatises, dissertations (*tractatus*), on the Psalms which seem very clearly to have been originally sermons and afterwards written out in commentary style. A glance at these confirms the judgment of Jerome that while Hilary imitated Origen he added some things of his own. Along with some acuteness there is much of idle speculation and allegorizing. There is no eloquence, and the

¹ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 10, col. 551. ² *Op. cit.*, tom. 9, col. 165.

style is not pleasing; but much reverence for Scripture appears and great desire to do good. On the whole Hilary is more important as a churchman and theologian, but deserves respect and consideration as a preacher.

Another Latin preacher and bishop of this age is Zeno (d. 380) of Verona.¹ His bust, along with those of many other distinguished sons or citizens, is found on the porch of the old town hall at Verona to this day; but it is hardly a likeness! It appears that he was born in north Africa early in the fourth century, and was chosen bishop of Verona in Italy in 362, filling that office till his death in 380. He was, like Hilary, a strenuous upholder of the Nicene creed and of church discipline. He enjoyed an excellent reputation for character and works. Some accounts call him a "martyr," but others only a "confessor," i.e., one who suffered but did not die for his faith.

Of his homiletical productions there remain ninety-three *tractates*—some of them very brief. It has been conjectured that these short addresses are either merely notes of what was expanded in delivery, or else were additional remarks or exhortations given by the bishop after the presbyter had preached. He had some merit as an orator—acuteness, fancy, considerable rhetorical culture and skill. He makes frequent—perhaps too frequent—use of illustration and apostrophe. His imitation of the Greek preachers is plain; and allegorizing is abundant and arbitrary.

Our knowledge of Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona (fl. c. 373), is very little.² Jerome in his *De Viris Illustribus* makes favorable mention of him as a man of high standing and noted for piety and eloquence. He seems to have been highly esteemed before becoming a Christian and bishop. He was married, and his son Dexter, to whom Jerome's book was dedicated, held high office under the emperor Honorius, after his father's death. Pacianus became bishop of Barcelona in Spain probably about 373, and died in old age in the time of Theodosius, before 392.

Two sermons of his remain. One is an exhortation to penitence. It is practical rather than doctrinal, and

¹ See Lentz, *Gesch. der Christl. Hom.*, Bd. I., S. 147; and Paniel, S. 716 ff. ² Paniel, S. 731.

contains some passages full of thought and eloquence. The other, on baptism, is not so good. His work shows familiarity with the classics, good knowledge of the Bible, and effective use of illustration. He resembles Cyprian, whom he studied with pleasure. He was evidently a preacher of considerable force, and we can only regret the scantiness of our knowledge of him and his work.

In Gaudentius of Brescia (d. c. 410)¹ we have again an interesting but too little known character. Neither his country nor the date of his birth is certainly known. But it is inferred that he was born at or near Brescia before the middle of the fourth century. In his young manhood he went to the East for travel and culture, and spent several years at Cæsarea in Cappadocia. While there his friend and teacher, the bishop of Brescia, died, and Gaudentius, at the instance of the older bishops, especially of Ambrose of Milan, was chosen bishop and urged by letters to return. The usual reluctance was expressed, but the eastern bishops were requested by their western brethren to deny to Gaudentius the communion until he should consent! This brought him home, and he was duly consecrated. He was required by the older bishops present to preach a sermon on the occasion of his own ordination. This sermon has come down to us and gives the facts just mentioned.

Among Chrysostom's letters while he was in exile is one addressed to Gaudentius thanking him for his interest in trying to secure for the archbishop a revocation of the decree of banishment. The old man says that Gaudentius' effort was a comfort to him in his lonely and neglected state, and speaks of Gaudentius as a friend whom neither time nor distance could estrange. It seems that the Italian did not long survive his distinguished friend, dying probably about the year 410 or later.

Gaudentius was highly honored for his piety and eloquence. A number of sermons of fairly sure authenticity remain. Among his hearers and friends was a citizen of Brescia who through illness missed a series of sermons that the bishop was giving during the fasting season. He asked Gaudentius to send him the sermons to read, as he could not hear them. The bishop agreed and sent

¹ Paniel, S. 771; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 20, col. 791.

him not only the ten fast sermons, but four other short addresses on different chapters of the Gospels, and also a panegyric on the Maccabean brothers, who were esteemed as martyrs. Of these last he says that he would not be responsible for them, as they had been taken down hastily and he had not looked over them, but the others (presumably the ten fast sermons) he had revised. Besides these there is the sermon at his ordination, and several others. In one of these he repeats the tradition that Peter was crucified with his head downward, and Paul was beheaded. As a preacher in point of style, thought and oratory he does not hold very high rank, but is worthy of remembrance.

From these less known men we turn to the highly renowned bishop of Milan, Ambrose (340-397).¹ His birth-place was probably Treves in Gaul, where his father was pretorian prefect, i.e., governor with military and civil jurisdiction over several provinces. A pretty story of Ambrose's babyhood is to the effect that bees once alighted on his mouth while he was asleep and the frightened nurse being about to drive them away the father forbade her, saying that it was an omen of future eloquence—honeyed speech. On the early death of his father Ambrose and his brother and sister were left to the care of their mother. The family affection was beautiful and enduring. None of the three ever was wedded; they were devoted to each other. In one of his sermons late in life Ambrose pays noble tribute to his brother, who had recently died, and elsewhere speaks tenderly of his sister.

The family moved to Rome in Ambrose's childhood, and he was educated—like Basil and Chrysostom—for the legal profession. He met with decided success in civil life. His fine talent for government was soon recognized and he was appointed *consular*, i.e., civil governor, of Liguria and Aemilia, with headquarters at Milan. The territory was large, embracing in our times, besides Milan, the cities of Genoa, Parma, Modena, and Bologna. Thus the appointment was one of distinction. It is related

¹ Authorities already noted and works of Ambrose in Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tt. 14-17; translations in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*.

that on his leaving Rome to take his office one of the high officers of the imperial court remarked that he would fulfil it "like a bishop." This only referred to the fidelity and conscientiousness which the man would carry to his task, but it was unconscious prophecy.

While Ambrose was governor at Milan, the Arian bishop died, and there was determined effort on the side of the orthodox party to secure the election of a bishop who should represent their views. The Arians were equally determined on their part. On the day of election there was fierce contention, and Ambrose went as governor to the church to quell the disturbance. While he was pleading for peace and order the voice of a child suddenly rang out, "Ambrose for bishop!" The crowd took it up. It was accepted as the voice of God, and both parties united on him, and in spite of his remonstrances elected him on the spot. He was only a catchu-men—had not yet been baptized, though long a Christian in heart. He tried to flee, but was overruled, baptized, and in eight days duly consecrated bishop of Milan!

He took office in a humble but devoted spirit, and feeling the deficiency of his theological education, went to work diligently to study the Bible and the Greek theologians and preachers—especially Origen and Basil. He preached regularly on Sundays and often on other occasions. He was much occupied with the cares of his large and exacting diocese, and took great interest in singing and worship. He was very accessible and affable as a pastor and was much beloved by his people. He was a firm disciplinarian and a man of determined courage. The signal instance of this is his refusal to admit the emperor Theodosius to the communion till the choleric monarch had purged himself by penance for the massacre of the populace of Thessalonica.¹ Even the cynical Gibbon² is aroused to admiration of this episode in the life of a Christian prelate, and concludes his account of it by saying, "The example of Theodosius may prove the beneficial influence of those principles which could force a

¹ The letter he wrote to the emperor concerning this is a model of fidelity, firmness and courtesy. See Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 16, col. 1209.

² *Decline and Fall*, Vol. III., p. 118 (Am. reprint of Milman's ed.).

monarch, exalted above the apprehension of human punishment, to respect the laws and ministers of an invisible Judge." In other ways also did the high-minded bishop show both his great interest in public affairs and the nobility and elevation of his own character. He was a conscientious and hard worker, and care wore upon him. Likewise the death of his beloved brother Satyrus fell upon him as a serious blow from which he never recovered. He died, not old, in his fifty-seventh year, 397.

Ambrose the man and bishop is greater than Ambrose the preacher. In studying his sermons and orations we cannot help a feeling of disappointment.¹ His principal remains in the way of sermons are his orations on the dead. That (in two parts) on his brother Satyrus is especially good.² It is full of love and grief for his brother, but shows the proper feeling of one who is a Christian, a pastor and a teacher, in view of so great an affliction. The oration on Theodosius is also notable. Others of his speeches and sermons were worked out after delivery and lack the fire of actual speech. His expositions of the Psalms are mostly borrowed from Origen, whom, if anything, he outdoes in allegorizing, and his *Hexaëmeron* is an undisguised copy from Basil. This plagiarism was not then considered so great an evil as it really is, and yet it remains a sad subtraction from the fame of a truly great and good man.

Among the great theologians and preachers of early church history, whether considered in regard to character, abilities, and work, or in regard to enduring influence and fame, no one stands higher than Aurelius Augustinus (354-430).³ He was born at Tagaste, in Numidia, north Africa, Nov. 13, 354. Augustine's father Patricius was of good family and a man of some influence in his town, but seems to have had a somewhat crabbed disposition and to have been a trial to his godly wife. Her influence

¹ This view is expressed by other critics as well as by Broadus, *Hist. Prea.*, p. 80.

² Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 16, col. 1346 ff.

³ A great literature deals with Augustine, yet rather as man and theologian than as preacher. Various editions of his works are easily accessible; translations in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Paniel hardly does Augustine justice as a preacher. There are more just and appreciative discussions in Rothe, Lentz, Brömel (*Homiletische Charakterbilder*), Nebe, and others.

and prayers had their final reward, and Patricius, long a heathen, became a Christian and was baptized late in life. Among the great Christian mothers of history Monica has a well deserved respect, and her grateful and gifted son has embalmed her memory in beauty and tenderness in the pages of his *Confessions*.

Augustine was sent to the best schools at his home and at Carthage. His pious mother had brought him up in the most tender and earnest Christian influences, but as is sadly too often the case, the temptations of the corrupt world about him proved too strong for the vigorous youth and he became wild and dissolute. He tells us in his immortal *Confessions* the sorrowful story of his downfall and his shames. They need not be repeated here. He ran the hard way of the transgressor and bitterly reaped, in all his after life of remorse and penitence, the fruits of his youthful follies and sins.

He became a teacher of rhetoric at Carthage. A passage in Cicero's *Hortensius* stirred in the young man of nineteen a desire to seek after God and to be a philosopher, and he gave himself with zest to study. From Carthage he went to Rome to teach and study, and from Rome to Milan.

His philosophical studies brought him into contact with the dualism of the Manichæan sect, and for a time he was caught in the meshes of that system. But it proved after long trial unsatisfactory, and he was turning to the Neo-Platonic philosophy in quest of intellectual and moral repose. This was about the time of his removal to Milan, where he began to practise his profession of rhetorical teacher. His patient and faithful mother came to him at Milan—probably after the death of her husband. He also had with him his illegitimate son, whom he had named Adeodatus—strange name for one who, though tenderly loved, was a perpetual reminder of his early manhood's faults. Here at Milan in his thirty-third year, intellectually dissatisfied and conscience-smitten for his evil youth, he came under the influence of the good and noble Ambrose. He went often to hear Ambrose preach, and by the blessing of God upon his mother's faithful labors and the bishop's good life and preaching, he was led to a full and joyful acceptance of the Christian faith.

He was baptized, along with his son Adeodatus, by Ambrose in 387. His pious mother lived to see this fruition of her hopes and prayers, but died shortly afterwards at Ostia, whence they were soon to depart for their old home in north Africa. Likewise the beloved son of Augustine's youth and error died early.

On his conversion Augustine quit his teaching, divided his property among the poor, and gave himself up to study, reflection and writing. Several of his theological and philosophical treatises belong to this period. He returned home and lived in retirement for a few years near Tagaste, when in 391 he was called to Hippo and made a presbyter by the bishop Valerius. On the death of the prelate in 395 Augustine was made bishop in his place. For thirty-five years he exercised that office, writing much, preaching often, administering with exemplary fidelity his charge, and living a life of true Christian nobility.

In 430 Hippo was besieged by the Vandals under Genseric. The aged bishop lay sick and worn in his plain chamber, the only decoration of the walls being passages from the penitential Psalms; thus he passed away August 28, 430, in his seventy-sixth year.

Passing by the greatness of Augustine as a theologian, a controversialist, a writer, we are here concerned with his preaching. He was very diligent in this work, often preaching five days in the week and sometimes twice a day. In his treatise, *On Christian Teaching*,¹ and in his two ordination sermons, he gives us his conception of the preaching office, and it is a high and just one, to which he endeavored to attain himself. He recognizes both the honor and the responsibility of the office, insisting that the preacher must teach by example as well as precept, and that he needs the prayers of his people. Well says Brömel of him: "What he taught that he lived, and what he lived that he taught—that was the power of his preaching."

In his famous and justly admired work, *On Christian*

¹ See Brömel, *Homiletische Charakterbilder*, Bd. I., S. 39 ff., who has a fine analysis and study of the treatise *On Christian Teaching*. This is well translated by J. F. Shaw in Dods' edition of the Fathers.

Teaching, Augustine relates an instance of the effect of his preaching.¹ He was addressing the rough Mauretanians and endeavoring to dissuade them from the feud (*caterva*), which was very common among them. "I strove with all the vehemence of speech I could command to root out and drive from their hearts and lives an evil so cruel and inveterate; it was not, however, when I heard their applause, but when I saw their tears, that I thought I had produced an effect. For the applause showed that they were instructed and pleased, but the tears that they were subdued. And when I saw their tears I was confident, even before the event proved it, that this horrible and barbarous custom was overthrown; and immediately that my sermon was finished I called upon them with heart and voice to give praise and thanks to God. And, lo, with the blessing of Christ it is now eight years or more since anything of the sort was attempted there." Modestly as this is told, it shows what a power Augustine must have sometimes had with his audiences.

In his preaching, as in his *Confessions*, there was the mystical trace—the devotion of a rapt soul, loving communion with God; and in his sermons, as in his theological and controversial writings, there was stern and fearless logic. He cared not so much for graces of style as for depth of matter and power of effect. To convince, persuade, instruct and win his auditors was his supreme concern. For pithy and telling sayings he is justly famous. Though he had been a teacher of rhetoric he was not so careful of order and decoration as would have seemed natural, or would indeed have been proper. He perhaps undervalued these in his intense concern to make his preaching effective. He also undervalued immediate preparation, and often came to his pulpit without having carefully thought out beforehand what he would say. Even so full, acute, logical a mind as his could not wholly overcome the consequences of this error, and his sermons—taken down by shorthand writers—abundantly show the weaknesses of such a method.

In his treatment of Scripture he follows the fashion of his time as to the allegorical interpretation, and perpetrates many a foolish and trivial blunder in exegesis.

¹ *De Doctrina Christiana*, lib. IV., cap. 24.

Sometimes he takes a text, sometimes not; sometimes he sticks to his text, sometimes not. Very many of his sermons are expository lectures on books of the Bible, continuous and fairly complete. Brömel considers those on the Gospel of John and on the Pauline Epistles to be the best, but many on the Psalms are of great devotional and spiritual power. His sermons deal very little with illustration, but the few illustrations he does employ are apt and telling. The deep earnestness of his nature and the power of his thought are the main elements of strength in his preaching. However mistakenly careless of form and beauty, these instinctively, as it were of themselves, appear in his work. Such a powerful soul as his could not but express itself in his preaching, but he might have been more eloquent, more attractive, and far more impressive, then and now, had he been more at pains to adorn his speech. The sermons are of very unequal length, and very unequal merit, as a consequence of his carelessness of preparation.

But take him all in all Augustine was the greatest Latin preacher. While he lived on into the fifth century for three decades, his work and influence belong really to the fourth, and mark the close of that wonderful and fruitful epoch in the history of the Christian pulpit which came to its culmination in Chrysostom and himself. The Greek wave rose first and highest, but soonest ebbed, and never has flowed again. Since Chrysostom there has been no really great Greek preacher. After Augustine also there was a marked decline for two centuries, and a dark period for five more in the West, when again the Latin pulpit, or rather Western preaching under Latin auspices, rose into new power for a time.

PERIOD II

THE EARLY MEDIÆVAL, OR DARK, AGE

A.D. 430-1905

After the times of Chrysostom and Augustine up to the preaching
of the First Crusade by Peter the Hermit and Pope Urban II

CHAPTER III

THE DECLINE OF ANCIENT PREACHING IN THE FIFTH AND SIXTH CENTURIES

We here take up the second general period as outlined for our studies, namely, the long dark age which reaches from the death of Augustine early in the fifth, to the call for the First Crusade at the end of the eleventh century. In the early part of this era the crumbling fragments of decaying ancient civilization were mingling with the crude beginnings of a new and very different stage of progress in human affairs. Vigorous and promising in many ways as these new beginnings really were, the thoughtful men of that gloomy transition could scarcely detect any promise of good in those forces which were accomplishing the overthrow of all that outwardly represented a past of power and glory. Decay was the age-token, and the feeling of hopelessness, the sense of defeat, the consciousness of being near the end of things, were only too common. The letters and other writings of Ambrose already sound the lament over a falling state; and Augustine's great work *De Civitate Dei* found its emphatic thought if not its actual suggestion in the painful yet glorious contrast between dying Rome and the truly eternal City of God. Thus the evening of antiquity closes down in shadows over Europe, and it is a long night of fitful

sleep, rude alarms, and barbaric orgies that follows, until the clarion call to the Crusades announces the dawn of the mediæval day.

Preaching, too, after Augustine, entered on a decline from which it did not recover till the twelfth century, and therefore for these studies as well as for general history the terms of the period are correctly placed. In this chapter we are concerned with the preaching of the fifth and sixth centuries, but it will be well to take a short preliminary glance at the history of the times so as to gain the proper orientation for our more specific study of the pulpit.

I. GENERAL SKETCH OF THE TIMES

Upon the death of the great Theodosius in 395 the empire was divided between his two weak sons, and there was no more union of the sovereignty in one hand. This division lay deep in the different characters of the people east and west, as well as in governmental convenience and other things; and it had been maturing for ages. It is true that in the sixth century for a short time the victories of Belisarius and Narses brought Italy and north Africa under the sway of Justinian, and that far later, in 1204, the Crusaders captured Constantinople and established a fleeting Latin sovereignty there; but these were episodes, and brief ones. The racial and political division was further emphasized by the schism between the churches, which was fast coming on, but in the sixth century was not yet accomplished. The ancient empire of Rome came to its pitiful end in this time. From without Goths and Vandals, Huns and Lombards, put the finishing touch to the age-long inner decay, and the majestic old structure of the Cæsars toppled and fell. Men were expecting it; and though in itself an impressive event to reflection, the scene which closed the tragedy was paltry enough for a farce. In 476 the last petty Roman emperor, a child in years and absurdly named Romulus Augustulus, surrendered his crown to Odoacer the Ostrogoth, who sent what was left of the imperial regalia to the emperor of the East; and so the great drama ended.

Not till the middle of the fifteenth century did the Turks do for Constantinople what the Teutons had done for

Rome in the fifth. In truth, during the sixth century the remarkable reign of Justinian (527-565) shed some rays of real and lasting glory upon the decadent East. While not himself a man of the first rank in either intellect or character, this emperor was fortunate and wise enough to find and employ men of genius. The military exploits, with the imperfect forces at their command and against powerful odds, of the great generals, Belisarius and Narses, were brilliant, though ineffectual in the end. More lasting was the magnificent work of the great lawyer Tribonian and his associates, who codified the confused and voluminous laws of the empire and thus rendered distinguished and lasting service not only to the science of jurisprudence, but through it to the general good of mankind. Nor must we forget Justinian's services to education, commerce and art, especially architecture. The world-famous church of St. Sophia was rebuilt in his reign, and so pleased was he with his work that on its completion he is said to have exclaimed, "I have outdone thee, O Solomon!"

Out of the chaos of ruin and rapine which marked the barbarian overthrow of Roman sovereignty in Europe something like order slowly emerged in the establishment of powers which eventually became, or contributed toward forming, the leading dukedoms and kingdoms of mediæval times. In Germany there was turmoil and confusion, but the defeat of the Huns at Chalons in 451 at least averted the menace of their conquest of central Europe. In Italy, first the Goths, and later the Lombards, laid foundations of real political power. In Spain the West Goths built up a kingdom which was a basis for future developments. The Burgundian power along the Rhine was important, both at the time, and as a source of coming events of great influence in history. In Gaul the Franks under Clovis, and in Britain the Anglo-Saxons were making the beginnings of France and England.

Meantime, amid the ruins of the old Roman empire and the confused beginnings of mediæval monarchies, the religious and secular power of the papacy was firmly established. Henceforth European history has to deal with a new power emanating from Rome as a centre, and potent still in the affairs of the world. The inner developments

of church polity, assisted by outer events and forces, had culminated through various grades of bishops in the institution of five great church rulers, called Patriarchs, and located at the cities of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Rome. The leading position among these naturally lay in dispute between the last two, and this became one of the chief elements of schism between the Greek and Latin churches. In addition to the natural and traditional odds in favor of the Roman bishop two circumstances now powerfully assisted in making him supreme: one was that he was the only Patriarch for all the Latin part of the church and world, the rest being all oriental and Greek; and the other was that the decline and fall of imperial authority and glory in the West enhanced the position of the Patriarch of Rome. All these advantages were opportunely pressed by the talents and force of character of Leo I. (440-461), who not only asserted his claims, but gave them their enduring Scriptural defence by urging in their support the words of Christ to Peter in Matthew 16:18, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church," etc. In addition to this Leo exerted great influence at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, and helped by personal pleas to avert or mitigate the horrors of barbarian attacks on Rome under Attila and Genseric. After Leo, Gregory the Great (590-604) did much to confirm and perpetuate the papal authority. In the hands of these two able men, one near the beginning and the other at the end of the epoch we have under review, we may regard the papacy as definitely and finally established. Such were the main influential events in this chaotic but formative era in European history.

2. THE DECLINE OF PREACHING

In an age like that of the fifth and sixth centuries it would be vain to expect any particular sphere of human endeavor to manifest tokens of vigor which were lacking in the general life of the times. Everything had gone into a decline, and preaching could not be exempt. But we must beware of being caught in the toils of generalization and concluding that there was no preaching at all, or that it was wholly bad. ✱ Both East and West there was

preaching, and there were some preachers of talent, character, and influence. Yet the general truth holds that it was an age of decay. Let us now take note of some of the general and local causes of this decline, and discuss some of the characteristics of the preaching.

We shall first notice the general causes which contributed to the decline of preaching in the fifth and sixth centuries, and then pay a little more particular attention to those which prevailed respectively in the East and in the West.

The general law of reaction is noticeable in the history of preaching, as it is in other histories. Preaching had reached the highest point of its ancient development in Chrysostom and Augustine. Rothe well remarks that it could go no higher than this without the coming in of a new spiritual life and power, and this is precisely what did not occur. The reaction was to be expected, and it came swiftly and sadly enough. This natural ebb-tide was concurrent with a rough sea of storm and turmoil in the world. The times were evil indeed. Barbarism threatened without and corruption sickened within the church as well as the state. The general corruption in morals affected balefully the lives of the clergy as well as the laity. Ambition, place-hunting, selfishness, greed, and even worse things were not unknown among those whose business it was to live as well as preach the gospel. Of course the faulty living of preachers is a too painful experience of every age of preaching, but when clerical unworthiness gains the upper hand the general effect is disastrous beyond measure. In a flourishing age this sore evil is a drawback, in a declining one it is an acceleration. It was so in these mournful times. While there were many godly and true preachers, it must be owned that not a few were only too willing to be both in the world and of it.

We should not fail also to take account of the growth of liturgy and forms of worship. While these preserved a prominent place for preaching in the services of the church their effect then, as too often since, was to make the spoken word of far less relative value than forms of worship. This tendency, while stronger in later times, was already powerful, and preaching was not vigorous

and able enough to overcome the trammels of liturgy. More serious than this was the growth of the hierarchical spirit, the conception of the preacher as priest rather than prophet. An acute student of the history of preaching¹ has remarked: "We find this change, I think, passing over the spirit of preaching after the second or third century. We shall see it reaching its head in the Dark Ages. But perhaps the worst effect of all was that wrought on the preacher himself, changing him from a messenger of God into a petty mediator and dispenser of God's mercies and punishments! This led to the preaching of church discipline rather than Christian morals, of penance rather than repentance. The heart of the gospel was too often wrapped in the rough and insipid husks of externalism, and it was more than the simple sinner could do to get at the kernel." Along with this perversion of gospel preaching went another which also waited for its full development in the mediæval sermons. This was the worship of Mary and the veneration of the saints. These were beginning to be looked upon as intercessors with God, and their votaries sought their mediation to obtain divine grace and mercies. Already in the fourth century traces of this worship are seen, and the development goes on through the fifth and sixth, to the injury of a pure gospel preaching.

Besides these general causes, which were operative in East and West alike, there were some which if not wholly absent from either locality, were yet specially active in one or the other. In the East the reaction was apparently more pronounced than in the West. The fall from Chrysostom was very great. It was not a total collapse indeed, but still the fact remains that no preacher of world-wide fame has appeared in the Greek Church since his day. Account for it as we may, and tone down the statement as much as possible, there is no evading the essential truth of the remark. The reaction was sharp and intense—it has been a long ebb, and history waits for the flow. The Greek mind seemed to have done its best work in preaching when it flowered in John of Antioch, and it fell back exhausted from that achievement. Imitation followed genius. Spontaneity and freshness failed.

¹ Fleming James, *The Message and the Messengers*, p. 101.

The little men of a declining age usually try to live on the brains of the great men who have preceded them. But inexorable history writes it down that the brains of one generation are not sufficient brain-food for the next. Echoes are not living voices—only faint and fainter tributes to greatness, admired but departed. If the bad taste of the age reflected itself in the faults of even fourth century preaching, what shall we say of it as a factor in the decline of which we are treating? The exaggeration, the bombast, the inflated oratory which marred the best preaching of the Patristic Age are hideous faults in the worst. There was nothing yet to correct the taste of either hearer or preacher, and this must have contributed greatly to the decay of preaching. It is true that this is partly conjectural, for we have not so many specimens from which to judge; but what indications there are fortify the natural inference.

The fierce doctrinal controversies which distracted the Eastern Church, and troubled the Western, during the fifth century must come in as one of the prominent causes of the decline of preaching. The rise of great controversies in doctrine has often stimulated preaching. But the protracting of controversy into barren and fine-spun metaphysics, and the degeneration of manly strife for great truths into personal and partisan polemics, have always had a bad effect. Following the Reformation there was an era of dogmatic discussion which reacted unfavorably on preaching, and this was true in the Greek Church of the fifth and sixth centuries. The great Arian controversy of the fourth century stirred the preachers during that epoch to great exertions. Chrysostom, and before him the Cappadocians, had felt the stimulus of endangered truth. But the settlement of the Nicene creed in the Council of Constantinople in 381 had cleared the air after a half century of debate. In the disputes of the following centuries—marked by the Councils of Ephesus in 431, of Chalcedon in 451, and of the second Constantinople in 553—there was a protracted struggle over fine points of doctrine, and the display of much unseemly violence and partisan selfishness. All this had a most unwholesome effect both on Christian character in general and on that of the clergy; and thus in many ways these

struggles tended to lower the tone and the effect of preaching. The Greek Church gained the orthodoxy in which she has complacently rested for a millenium and a half at the expense of the very life of her pulpit.

As already remarked the reaction from excellence was hardly so marked in the West as in the East. This was partly because there was not so much to react from. The oratorical excellence of Ambrose and Augustine is not so striking as that of the Cappadocians and Chrysostom. Ambrose is but an echo of Basil, and Augustine as an orator is as much below Chrysostom as Cicero is below Demosthenes—though not in the same ways. Then the followers of the great Latin preachers are not so much behind their models as is the case with the Greeks. Leo and Gregory of Rome are not so distinctly inferior as preachers to Augustine as Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret are to Chrysostom. Yet notwithstanding this cautionary comparison we still must assign reaction as one cause of decline in the West as well as in the East. Augustine's mighty thinking finds no parallel in his immediate followers. Leo comes nearest, but he is a great way off. It is a long journey from Augustine to Bernard,¹ but that is how far we have to travel before we find another very eminent preacher who uses the Latin tongue, and that is on the eve of its displacement by the new languages of Europe.

The West felt more directly and powerfully than the East the pressure of Barbarian invasion. Alaric sacked Rome in 410, Attila threatened, but was defeated at Châlons in 451, Genseric and his Vandals pillaged the city in 455, and the pitiful remnants of empire were surrendered to Odoacer at Ravenna in 476. The fear of plunder, death and disgrace; the despair of preserving anything from the wreck of the social system; the general sense of helplessness and dread, were not favorable conditions for the cultivation of eloquence, secular or sacred. The weakness and fall of government also were depressing after the patronage of former years. This state of things was somewhat paralleled by that in France after the age of Louis XIV.—an era of splendid pulpit eloquence and court patronage, followed by a long decline.

¹ Died 1153.

Leo I. and Gregory I. are the founders of the papacy. Either one may be considered the first pope, though it rather lies upon Gregory to be so regarded. On the ruins of secular empire came the papacy. The story belongs to general church history, but the thing for us here to notice is that though both Leo and Gregory were preachers of considerable merit, the growth of papal government was not favorable to preaching. Already in Ambrose the governing instinct of the Latin mind had encroached upon pulpit eloquence. And Leo's cares of government, his efforts to aggrandize the Roman see, his bold claim to pre-eminence based on the primacy of Peter, his successful assertion of doctrinal leadership at Chalcedon, and his services in pleading with Attila and Genseric on behalf of Rome, while they showed him the great leader and prelate, were certainly not distinctive marks of the preacher. So in general the growth of the hierarchy and the strengthening of prelacy were not favorable to the cultivation of preaching. The rise of the mendicant orders of preachers in the thirteenth century, and the great preaching of the reformers in the sixteenth, were not prelatical products.

Along with this we must emphasize what has already been mentioned among the general causes—the larger place given to church discipline, penances, and the like. Ecclesiastical duties and almsgiving as a means of grace were beginning to receive more homiletical attention than grace itself. This was markedly true in the West. Under all these circumstances it is no wonder that preaching declined. The wonder is that it survived, and that amid such untoward influences there were found both East and West some preachers of ability who still held forth the word of life.

A number of the most striking characteristics of preaching in this age have been already indicated in the discussion of the causes which led to its decline. These need not be repeated here, but some additional matters will claim our notice. As with the causes of decline some of these characteristics are general, and some are more notable in the East or in the West.

The sermon retains its character as an expository discourse. It varies still from the more extended address

to the briefer homily. In form and content it remains much what the fourth century developed. Only the decline of power is apparent, as has been shown in the preceding discussion. The allegorical interpretation—except in Theodoret and a few others of the Antiochian school—has the field. The enforcing of churchly duties is a large element in the preaching. The growth of liturgical forms, while depressing to preaching, has yet given to it a recognized and permanent place in the services of the church. It has become what a modern German writer on Homiletics defines it even now to be: "Worship in discourse, and discourse in worship."¹

Besides what has been already pointed out, we should observe that in the East the speculative quality of thought is more prominent, and the rhetorical art and effort more apparent, than in the West. Among the Latins there is less of speculation and more of the practical in doctrinal discussion. Strong emphasis is placed on the church and its life and duties, its liturgy and demands. Less attention is paid to oratorical finery, and the sermons are usually briefer than in the East, some so brief as to suggest that they were only expository remarks, or additional exhortations made by the bishop after the longer discourse of a presbyter.

3. THE GREEK PREACHERS

Among the Greeks there were many preachers, and a few who for various reasons were men of note and influence. Of these we shall select for brief mention five less known and two of greater prominence and fame.

A very interesting character is Synesius (d. c. 420),² bishop of Ptolemais in Cyrene, north Africa. He was of good family and well educated. At one time he was among the pupils of the famous woman philosopher, Hypatia, at Alexandria. He had read much and traveled extensively, and was an easy-going man of the world, a Neo-Platonist in philosophy. In some way he was brought under Christian influences—of a sort—and seems

¹ "Ein Cultus-Act der Rede, das ist das bestimmende Moment; und ein Rede-Act im Cultus, das ist der abhängige." Th. Harnack, *Geschichte und Theorie der Predigt*, S. 12.

² Möller in Herzog; Schaff's *History*, Vol. III., p. 604 f. There is a clever presentment of Synesius in Kingsley's *Hypatia*.

to have had, along with much philosophy, some real Christian views and principles. He owned an estate in the country near Ptolemais, and was fond of country life—gardening, hunting, and the like. He had much influence and was much respected by his neighbors, and the times being troublous he was urged—though married and yet unbaptized—to become bishop of Ptolemais. Synesius felt some honorable scruples, and moreover insisted upon being allowed to retain his wife and his dogs if he should accept the office! Nevertheless he was persuaded by Theophilus of Alexandria and others to accept the bishopric, and was baptized and ordained by the archbishop himself. Though thus conscientiously reluctant to enter the office he made a faithful bishop in kindly care of his flock. Epistles, treatises and hymns of his remain, but only two homilies, and they of small moment. He had the oratorical gift and training, and though we have no fair samples of his preaching to judge by, we may infer that he was a speaker of more than ordinary force.

Among the notable theologians and scholars of this age a high place is held by Theodore (d. 428)¹, bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, the friend of John Chrysostom, the pupil of Diodorus. He was probably born at Antioch, where he was trained in rhetoric by Libanius, and designed for the law. But he was persuaded by his friend John to retire with himself from the world and study the Bible under Diodorus. A bright vision of love crossed his path and he was about to go back to the world, when John's eloquent pleadings again prevailed and Theodore finally devoted himself to the religious life. Soon he was made a presbyter, and in 394 bishop of Mopsuestia. In this same year he preached on some occasion in Constantinople a sermon which received warm commendation from the emperor Theodosius. Yet it is as theologian and commentator that Theodore is best known. Of his voluminous writings not many remain, and some of these chiefly in Latin translations. Among the fragments Paniel notes only a few, and those unimportant, of a homiletical character. His style was not attractive—"neither brilliant nor very clear," according to Photius—and he wearies by too much repetition. Yet he enjoyed

¹Möller in Herzog-Plitt, Bd. 15, S. 394; Paniel, S. 582.

considerable reputation as a preacher, and it is to his lasting credit that he sought to present the historical and grammatical meaning of Scripture rather than the allegorical.

Homiletic interest, or rather curiosity, is awakened toward Nestorius,¹ the famous heretic who was condemned at Ephesus in 431. The fame of his eloquence had induced the emperor Theodosius II. in 428 to make him archbishop of Constantinople. For a while he enjoyed great popularity as a preacher, but his zeal against heretics made enemies for him; and his opposition to giving the title "Mother of God" to Mary and his error as to the Person of Christ were used against him, and he was deposed and banished. The Council of Ephesus in 431, under the influence of Cyril of Alexandria, made him drink the bitter cup of persecution for heresy which he had himself forced on others. Some fragments and reports of his discourses remain, but as these come from his opponents they cannot be regarded as fair specimens of his work. Rothe, however, conjectures that he must have been a preacher of more than usual abilities.

We have better means of judging concerning Proclus, who was made archbishop of Constantinople in 434. In his young manhood he had served Chrysostom as secretary, and was a careful student of rhetoric. So he had a good chance to learn oratory. He was a presbyter at Constantinople at the time of the Nestorian controversy, and is said to have been the first to attack in a sermon Nestorius' objection to calling Mary the "Mother of God." He enjoyed great popularity as a preacher. Twenty-three of his sermons remain, three on Mary, the rest delivered on feast days and Apostles' days. They are mainly theological and polemical, with little of practical application. He is often declamatory, dealing much in exclamation, antithesis, and other devices for rhetorical effect. The sermons show considerable vigor of expression and liveliness of imagination; they are usually without text, are of unequal length, and commonly have an introduction, and at the conclusion a doxology, after the manner of Chrysostom. Of one of those on Mary Rothe says: "The sixth homily consists almost entirely

¹ Rothe, S. 127 f.

of long dialogues between Mary, Joseph and the angel Gabriel, and Christ himself; and of a very pathetic monologue by Satan!"

There was, in this age, a Basil (d. c. 448), who was bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, from whom there remain forty-three sermons. Little is known of his life. He was a warm, even enthusiastic, partisan of the claims of the Virgin Mary as these were then understood, but he seems to have taken rather a wavering position in the Eutychian controversy. As a preacher he is estimated higher than Proclus. He is hot in polemics against heretics and Jews, given to much empty declamation, and is a far-off imitator of Chrysostom. Yet he has some merits—handles his text historically and fairly well, and makes some practical application.

Two other preachers of this time are of far greater importance than those we have just noticed, both as church leaders and as speakers—one representing the Alexandrian, the other the Antiochian school.

Cyril¹ of Alexandria (d. 444) was nephew of the infamous Theophilus, the enemy of Chrysostom. He succeeded his evil uncle as patriarch of Alexandria about the year 412, and was an apt pupil of his predecessor in selfishness, intrigue, and even violence. Cyril was a member of the synod which condemned Chrysostom, and afterwards when in a later synod the unrighteous sentence against the famous preacher was revoked and tardy justice done his memory long after his death, Cyril voted against the revocation, and compared Chrysostom to Judas! Yet, after all this, it must be said that under pressure of church authority he did admit Chrysostom's name among those of the saints and martyrs on the memorial tablets of the Alexandrian church. As an instance of his violence it is said that soon after taking office as archbishop he closed the churches and seized the church property of the Novatians as being heretics. In 415 the Jews in Alexandria, because of his injustice toward them, raised a riot, and Cyril authorized an armed onslaught on their synagogues. Some were killed, many driven away and their property plundered. This high-

¹ Lentz, I., S. III.; Schaff, Vol. III., p. 942 ff; Rothe, S. 122; Gibbon, Chap. XLVII.; Kingsley's *Hypatia*.

handed assumption of authority brought him into conflict with the imperial governor Orestes. Some writers hold him responsible for the brutal and atrocious murder of Hypatia, the beautiful and accomplished teacher of pagan philosophy in Alexandria. The mob that murdered her was led by Peter the reader, a violent adherent of Cyril, whose sympathies were probably in favor of the proceeding. But there does not seem to be enough evidence to prove that he directly ordered or instigated it. Before, at and after the Council of Ephesus (431) Cyril was the able, unscrupulous and violent opponent of Nestorius and his teachings. He stuck at no measures of bribery and violence to carry his point. Schaff says that "he exhibits to us a man making theology and orthodoxy the instruments of his passions," and quotes Milman as saying, "Who would not meet the judgment of the divine Redeemer loaded with the errors of Nestorius rather than the barbarities of Cyril?" The Catholics find it hard to apologize for canonizing him, and the fine historical romance of Kingsley has given him an evil name in literature.

As a theologian and preacher Cyril is entitled to more consideration than his character would warrant, for he was an able exponent of the Alexandrian school. He posed as the friend of hidden wisdom, and of course pushes very far the allegorical interpretation of Scripture. It was customary for the archbishop of Alexandria to write and send forth at certain seasons an address or circular letter to the churches of his diocese. A number of these appear among the works of Cyril as homilies. Of the twenty-nine remaining, seventeen are said to be concerned with the title of Mary—"Mother of God"—then so hotly disputed. Besides these there remain thirteen other discourses which deal much with that doctrinal strife. The most noted was delivered in the Church of Mary at Ephesus before the famous council of the year 431, after that body had solemnly decreed that the disputed title should be given to the Mother of Jesus. The sermon was deposited among the acts of the council. There is another sermon which treats of the Lord's Supper as a "mystical meal," in which "Christ acts as host." Another treats of the future state of the wicked, and de-

scribes with elaborate detail the sufferings of hell. It has many vigorous and striking passages, but it is overdone, and the effect is spoiled by exaggeration. The speaker seemed to take pleasure in picturing the awful fate of the lost. Cyril does not lack fancy and richness of imagery. Some of his sermons show a good deal of logical skill as well as rhetorical effectiveness. But after all Rothe has this to say: "The passionate, violent, angry character of the man impresses itself also on his sermons. His polemic is violent and bitter, and full of passionate personal attacks upon his opponents. Moreover there passes through his addresses a rather consuming than warming glow of feeling and fancy, which, better guided, might have brought forth extraordinary effects." How true it is that the evil traits of a man's character may hinder and even ruin his influence, although he be gifted with unusual talents!

We find a very different sort of man from Cyril in his contemporary and sometimes opponent, Theodoret (d. 457),¹ bishop of Cyrus in Syria. This distinguished historian and exegete was born at Antioch about the year 390. He, like many another eminent divine, was blessed with an especially good Christian mother, who took pains with his education. He was trained in a monastery, and received the impress though not the personal instructions of the eminent teacher Diodorus, who had taught Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia. This last scholar and prelate had also great, and possibly personal, influence over Theodoret, in whose work is seen the safer historical and grammatical interpretation of Scripture pursued by the Antiochene scholars as compared with those of Alexandria. After 420 Theodoret appears as bishop of Cyrus, a town of no great importance in Syria. He was opposed to Cyril in his violent dealings with Nestorius, though he did not go as far as Nestorius toward teaching the theory of the dual personality in our Lord. He was moderate. Under Cyril's influence he was condemned at Ephesus in 431; and the so-called "Robber Synod" in 449 went so far as actually to depose him from

¹ Schaff, Vol. III., p. 881 f; Rothe, S. 129 ff; Lentz, I., S. 116 ff; Möller in Herzog, Bd. 15, S. 401 ff.

his bishopric. But the Council of Chalcedon in 451 acquitted and restored him on condition of his accepting the condemnation of Nestorius and agreeing to the title "Mother of God" as applied to Mary. These concessions he could make without much compromise, as he was not in full accord with Nestorius in doctrine, though personally opposed to his condemnation, and by no means an admirer of Cyril. As bishop Theodoret led an exemplary life, in fact he had been pious and pure from his childhood, and had served in some of the minor offices of the church with fidelity and success. Even his enemies had to acknowledge the goodness of the man, especially his benevolence and charity. "He owned nothing of value save his books, applying the revenues of his diocese to the public good."

He is especially valuable to posterity as a church historian, continuing the narrative of Eusebius down to the year 429. But as an exegete and preacher he has received high praise from scholars who have studied his works. As a preacher he was active and laborious, visiting other towns than his own and working for the conversion of sinners and heretics. He had no sweeping eloquence, but must have been a clear, keen reasoner. His style is simple and straightforward and not overloaded with ornament. There remain from him an interesting series of ten sermons delivered ten days apart at Antioch before he was made bishop of Cyrus. They treat of Divine Providence. He proves the providence of God from natural religion, from the guidance of nature and of men, from evidences of design (using in an elaborate way the human hand as an illustration), and from the arrangements of society. The last sermon sets forth the incarnation and saving work of Christ as the highest and crowning token of God's providence. Altogether Theodoret was a preacher of considerable ability and importance. Indeed Rothe says of him that "he is the only classical preacher that the Greek church has after Chrysostom." We may therefore close our survey of Eastern preaching in this epoch with him. The Greek preachers of the sixth century are hardly worth study. The age of Justinian, with its great generals and lawyers, produced no great preacher.

In the West as in the East we find in this period a

number of men whose characters and deeds are of considerable interest and importance in Church History, but when we look for any who are exceptionally influential or distinguished as preachers we shall look in vain. Judging from the specimens that have come down to us we can only rate the Latin preaching of the fifth and sixth centuries as mediocre, but it may well be that much of the best work has left no literary remains of itself. Certainly there was no utter dearth of preaching, and we may mention a few of the better known or more important preachers in each century as representatives of their less known brethren. Of the men of the fifth century four only will, for different reasons, and as representatives of different tendencies, receive notice.

Among the great missionary preachers of all time, and adorning this obscure age, was the apostle and saint of Ireland, Patricius, better known to us as St. Patrick.¹ The legends and myths which, however piously meant, have distorted and marred his real image must not blind us to the fact that he was a historic person, and that he did a great and noble work, whose influence and blessing extended far beyond his own age and people. There remain no sermons from him, but his "Confessions" are regarded as genuine, and there are also some letters which may be so accepted. From these we learn the main facts of his life and labors. The story is told with great humility, but it reveals in its very simplicity the noble character of the man, and gives some inkling of the power and success of his preaching. He was born in Scotland, the son of a priest or deacon, at Bonaven, now known as Kilpatrick, probably about the year 372. The barbarous Scots from Ireland (then their main habitation) often made forays into Britain, and in one of these they captured the youth and carried him away into slavery. After a time he managed to escape and return to his native land. But the godless condition of the heathen among whom he had lived as a slave preyed on his mind, and he resolved to go back and preach to them the gospel of

¹ C. Schoell in Herzog, Bd. II., S. 292 ff; F. F. Walrond, *Christian Missions before the Reformation*, p. 7 ff., a brief, popular, but well-considered and interesting account. The sources and literature are well given in the article by Schoell.

Christ. No words can tell the story as well as his own: ¹ "Against my wishes I was forced to offend my relations and many of those who wished me well. It was not in my own power, but it was God who conquered in me and withstood them all; so that I went to the people of Ireland to preach the gospel, and suffered many insults from unbelievers, and many persecutions, even unto bonds, giving up my liberty that I might be made a blessing to others. And if I am found worthy I am willing to give up my life with joy for his name's sake." He would sometimes beat a drum to call the people together in the open air, and then would preach to the crowd. He gathered pupils about him, and they would travel over the country reading and expounding the Gospels. His visits were usually brief, but sometimes he would remain longer in one place; and there is an interesting account of his work at the capital, Tara, made famous in literature by Moore's song, "The harp that once through Tara's halls." Here he gained many converts, as well as in other places. Glad indeed should we be if we had any specimens of his sermons to study, but if we had they would probably be very inadequate tokens of his real power in preaching. For we should not have had them (nor probably have been able to understand them if we had!) in the native language in which they were spoken; but only in Latin reports of them made by himself or his scholars. So perhaps we need not much regret the lack. The secret of his power is well expressed in Walrond's words: ² "In all that he did, and in every moment of every day, he relied upon the constant guidance and support of that God whose word he was engaged in publishing." After years of laborious and successful toil he seems in the evening of his life to have rested somewhat, and to have passed away in peace.

We come into a very different atmosphere when we leave this free, live, devoted missionary of the far West, and drop back among the prelatical and more distinctly Latin preachers of decadent Italy. Of these three may be mentioned as representative, but only one of them is worthy of much consideration. ³

¹ Quoted from Walrond, *op. cit.*, p. 16. ² *Op. cit.*, pp. 23, 24.

³ Information chiefly derived from the works of Schaff, Lentz, Rothe, etc.

Peter (d. 451) was the name of the leading bishop of Ravenna during this falling epoch when the feeble Roman imperial court had removed from the Eternal City to that fastness. His appointment at the seat of government indicates that he was a man of some influence. He filled the office for eighteen years, from 433 till his death. In later times he was surnamed Chrysologus—"golden speech"—probably from the flowing style of his writings rather than from their eloquence. It is a note of declining taste when so tame a writer receives such an appellation. There remain one hundred and seventy-six short sermons attributed to him. They are not strong or sublime, and explain the Scriptures after the allegorical method, but in a simple way and with evident desire to benefit his hearers. He has much to say of alms, fasting, and the other accepted churchly virtues.

From Maximus (d. 465), bishop of Turin, about the middle of the fifth century, there are extant seventy-three brief homilies. He is said to have had a fine faculty for impromptu address, and Rothe keenly remarks that there is sufficient evidence of unpremeditated speech in these sermons! They are full of allegorical interpretation, and they also contain numerous anecdotes of the saints and like material, giving notice of the rise of that style of sermon. They are not of much intrinsic interest or value, but as samples from the times they are instructive. One curious homily discusses an eclipse of the moon, and roundly scolds the people for keeping up the old heathen custom of making a loud outcry, as if that would have any effect in causing the shadow to pass, as if God needed any such help as this in removing the trouble!

The most important Latin preacher of the fifth century after Augustine is Leo (d. 461), the famous bishop of Rome, who is sometimes considered the first pope in the proper sense. He was probably born in Rome, though neither the time nor the place of his birth is certainly known. He had filled some of the minor offices of the church in Rome when in 440, during his absence, he was unanimously and cordially elected bishop. He exercised this office in a faithful and distinguished manner during his twenty-one remaining years of life, and is not without reason called "the Great." He held a very exalted opinion

of the supremacy of the Roman see, claiming the right of Rome to pass on all matters of doctrine and practice for the whole church. Leo was a strong theologian and took part with intelligence and success in the doctrinal controversies of his age. In 449 he wrote to Flavian, bishop of Constantinople, a letter against the error of Eutyches as to the fusion of the two natures in our Lord's person. This letter was the basis of the decree of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 which defined the two natures in the one person of Christ. This gave Leo great doctrinal authority through Christendom. He also took an active interest in secular affairs. He is said to have induced Attila the Hun (in 452) to spare Rome, and also to have moderated somewhat the destructive Vandals under Genseric, when they sacked and pillaged the city in 455. Thus Leo was a many-sided and very able man. His life was without reproach, and he gave great and conscientious care to his flock.

As a preacher he has some especial claims to attention. He is the first of the Roman bishops from whom we have sermons remaining. Of these ninety-six are with reasonable probability reckoned genuine.¹ He was a diligent preacher, believing earnestly that this was an indispensable part of his duty as a bishop. The sermons are short—as was then customary in the Latin churches. As we have them it is estimated that even the longest would only have occupied twenty minutes in delivery, many of them only half that time. But the reports may be shorter than the actual sermons were. They are occupied largely with festivals, fasts, saints' days, and other occasions. Only a few are expository at all, nor do they much discuss the great doctrines. They urge the churchly virtues of fasts, alms, and penance, and teach that these are meritorious works. In style they are rather ambitious and brilliant, abounding in antitheses and pregnant sayings. Leo is a warning against making more of style than of matter; for it is a sharp and not wholly unjust criticism of Lentz that if the order of the words be changed, or other words be used to express the thought, the merit would be gone.

While not particularly profound in thought or specially

¹ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 54, col. 141; translations in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. XIII.

edifying in tone the sermons contain a good deal that is worthy of note. The sixty-first sermon¹—eighth on the Passion—discusses the arrest of Jesus, the sinful compliance of Pilate, the greater guilt of the Jews, the meaning of Christ's bearing his own cross and of Simon's sharing it, and how we should see the deeper meaning of the crucifixion as taught by our Lord's own words. Then in a long apostrophe he speaks of the attractive power of the cross, and concludes as follows: "Let us then, dearly beloved, confess what the blessed teacher of the nations, the Apostle Paul, confessed, saying, 'Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.' For God's mercy towards us is the more wonderful that Christ died not for the righteous nor for the holy, but for the unrighteous and wicked; and though the nature of the Godhead could not sustain the sting of death, yet at his birth he took from us that which he might offer for us. For of old he threatened our death with the power of his death, saying by the mouth of Hosea, the prophet, 'O death, I will be thy death, and I will be thy destruction, O hell.' For by dying he underwent the laws of hell, but by rising again he broke them, and so destroyed the continuity of death as to make it temporal instead of eternal. . . . And so, dearly beloved, let that come to pass of which St. Paul speaks, 'that they that live should henceforth not live to themselves but to him who died for all and rose again.' And because the old things have passed away and all things are become new, let none remain in his old carnal life, but let us all be renewed by daily progress and growth in piety. For however much a man be justified, yet so long as he remains in this life he can always be more approved and better. And he that is not advancing is going back, and he that is gaining nothing is losing something. Let us run then, with the steps of faith, by the works of mercy, in the love of righteousness, that keeping the day of our redemption spiritually, 'not in the old leaven of malice and wickedness, but in the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth,' we may deserve to be partakers of Christ's resurrection, who with the Father and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth forever and ever. Amen."

¹ *Nic. and P.-Nic. Fath.*, Vol. XII., pp. 171 ff.

In the sixth century only three names need detain us, but these are for different reasons well worthy of mention. Fulgentius (d. 533) was bishop of a town called Ruspe in north Africa. He was born about the year 468 of a senatorial family in that region. He had in youth good educational advantages, and he improved them. He was blessed with a good Christian mother. An indication of her influence and of his disposition is found in the fact that on being appointed to some government position, before entering the ministry, he found the exactions for taxes so harsh and distasteful that he gave up the office. He leaned toward the monastic life, but events called him to activity and to suffering. The Arian king of the Vandals persecuted the orthodox Christians, and Fulgentius was among those who suffered. Against his will he was made bishop of Ruspe, and soon afterwards was banished, along with other orthodox bishops, to the island of Sardinia. Towards the end of his life he was, under some change of sentiment, recalled to his bishopric. He was an able and clear-headed man, well versed in the Scriptures, in the questions of the day, in the older Christian writers, and especially in the works of Augustine, whom he greatly admired and imitated. Ten sermons among those attributed to him are considered to be probably genuine.¹ Some resemble Augustine in style, but the most of them are imitations of Leo. Thus they possess no particular originality or power.

Cæsarius (d. 542), for forty years bishop of Arles, in Gaul, was born near Chalons, about the year 470. He was at an early age a monk in the cloister at Lerins, then deacon, then presbyter, then abbot, and finally in 501 was made bishop of Arles. He was a man of great piety and force of character, and is one of the most important men of his time. He was truly evangelical in spirit and devoted in labors, and was a leader in the Gallican church in his day. He had no easy life. In various ways he was annoyed and even persecuted, on charges of disloyalty and the like, by first one and then another of the barbaric kings—Frank, Burgundian, and Goth. But amid all his trials he was a faithful and diligent bishop, and believed much in preaching. He also gave much and fruitful at-

¹ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 65, col. 719.

tention to singing as a part of worship. A number of sermons ascribed to him remain, but not all are certainly genuine.¹ He was earnest in urging faith and a true conception of the work of Christ. In fact he was Augustinian in his theology, and his utterances against the merits of mere churchly works are remarkable in that age. He was accustomed to use many illustrations from life in his preaching, trying to reach the common people and earnestly opposing all sorts of superstitions. His sermons, or those ascribed to him, were much quoted and used throughout the mediæval period. In this respect he almost takes place beside Augustine and Gregory the Great, the three being inexhaustible sources for later plagiarism.

The patristic or ancient period in the history of preaching fitly closes with Gregory,² called the Great, who was bishop of Rome, or, as we may now say, pope, from 590 to 604. He was born at Rome about the year 540 of an ancient and wealthy family of senatorial rank. During the temporary supremacy of the Eastern Empire over Italy in consequence of the decline of the Gothic kingdoms and the victories of Belisarius and Narses, the famous generals of Justinian, Gregory was appointed to a high civil position in Rome. He discharged the duties of his office with fidelity and success; but he had a longing for the monastic life, which found expression for a time in his endowing several monasteries. After his father's death he turned his own house into a cloister, of which he became himself a member, and practiced the strictest asceticism. In 579 he was appointed by Pelagius II., bishop of Rome, a legate or ambassador to the court of Constantinople—a position which he filled with ability, as he was skilled in diplomacy and executive management. After several years he returned and was made abbot of his convent. It was about this time that he is said to have noticed the fair and handsome English prisoners in the slave market, who called forth his admiration and sympathy, and awakened in him a desire for the conversion of that far-off heathen people. In 590 he was elected

¹ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 67, col 1041.

² Mostly the same authorities as before; works in Migne, and translations in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. XII.

bishop of Rome. While he did not in the matter of the title push the papal claims as far as Leo had done, he held to all the substantial things that his great predecessor had gained, and with much apparent personal humility asserted the supremacy of the Roman see. Schaff well says of him:¹ "He combined great executive ability with untiring industry, and amid all his official cares he never forgot the claims of personal piety. In genius he was surpassed by Leo I., Gregory VII., Innocent III., but as a man and a Christian he ranks with the purest and most useful of the popes." He was very active in all departments of his work, extending his jurisdiction in all the West. He welcomed Spain back from the Arian heresy, the result of Vandal and Gothic influences; he sent the monk Augustine to England to labor for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, and performed many other acts of importance as pope. He reformed the liturgy and the music of the Roman church, and gave a start or a fresh impulse to many elements of ecclesiastical life.

Among Gregory's works is a celebrated treatise on the pastoral (episcopal) office called *Liber Regulæ Pastoralis*, or, more briefly, "Pastoral Rule." It was written in the first year of his pontificate, and addressed to Leander of Seville. It owes something to the similar work of Gregory Nazianzen, to which he refers in the prologue to part third, but apparently nothing to Chrysostom's treatise on the Priesthood.² The work treats of the responsibilities of the pastoral office, of the character of those who should be pastors, of the kind of teaching appropriate to different classes in the flock, and other such matters. It contains much sound advice suitable for all times, together with much that is trivial and weak. There is very little that bears specifically upon preaching, and nothing in the way of homiletical theory or rules; but the general teaching of the book and a few hints here and there show both just ideas and a high regard for the preaching part of the pastor's office. The book enjoyed a great repute in its own and subsequent times, and had the distinction of being translated into Anglo-Saxon by Alfred the Great,

¹ *Ch. Hist.*, Vol. IV., p. 212.

² Barmby's *Prolegomena* to the *Pastoral Rule*, *Nic. and Post-Nic. Fathers*, Vol. XII.

and of being especially recommended by enactments of Charlemagne.

As a preacher Gregory was, like Leo, very diligent. He conscientiously held it to be one of his prime duties to preach and to instruct his people. Sixty-two of his homilies remain, twenty-two on Ezekiel, and forty on the Gospels, based on the passages appointed for the day. Some of the sermons were committed to writing by himself, and others were taken down by reporters and revised by himself. Usually they are brief, but several are of considerable length. As sermons they cannot claim very high rank. The style is often barbarous and inelegant, the arrangement of no special worth, the thought not rich nor deep, and the Scripture interpretation full of the allegorical method and often puerile. The homilies consist usually of short paraphrases of the text, and of moral application of it. Two things deserve especial mention: (1) He puts, as was natural from his monastic bent and training, great emphasis upon the contemplative element of the religious life; and (2) he recognizes and assumes, both by precept and example, the important place of preaching in Christian worship.

The character, the work, the time of Gregory, all unite to make him the Pharos of the transition between ancient and mediæval church history. He belongs to both epochs.¹ As Christlieb well says: "There meet in him the decline and the new strengthening (though not the new life) of preaching. On the one side his place is here; on the other he is the beginning point of the Middle Ages."

CHAPTER IV

THE LOW ESTATE OF PREACHING IN THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CENTURIES

As the note of the fifth and sixth centuries is decline, so that of the seventh and eighth is chaos. It was a strange, wild time, with everything in confusion. The old East was in its dotage and the new West in its childhood. The great peoples and governments of mediæval and modern Europe were making their crude beginnings.

¹ See Christlieb, in Herzog, Bd. 18, S. 486, 487.

Christianity in all its phases and institutions reflected the character of the times, but even in its corruptions and perversions it was at once the best conservator of the ancient good and the surest guarantee for the future.

I. A GLANCE AT THE TIMES

In order that we may the better place ourselves for studying the preaching and preachers of the period, some of the most important events and movements in both political and religious history should be rapidly recalled.

This epoch witnessed the rise and wonderful early spread of Mohammedanism. The flight of Mohammed occurred in 622, his death ten years later, and in just a century after that, in 732, Charles Martel defeated the Saracens on the plain between Tours and Poitiers. In these hundred years many of the fairest provinces of the Eastern empire had been forever wrung from Greek control, Constantinople itself seriously threatened, Egypt and north Africa overrun and firmly held, Spain subjected, and all western Europe menaced by the Saracen invasion.

In the Byzantine empire some glory was shed on decay by the brilliant but futile victories of the emperor Heraclius, but state and church were torn and weakened by the long and weary strife over the worship of images and by the controversy whether in the Person of Christ there is one will or two.

In the seething, turbulent West new nations, peoples and languages are forming from chaotic elements. Italy witnesses the downfall of the exarchate of Ravenna and with it the final departure of even the most shadowy political connection with the East; likewise the rise of the Lombard kingdom, the nucleus of the Papal States, and the foretokening of a new Empire soon to be established under the Franco-German kings. Germany is as yet missionary ground where a few toilers are sowing seeds of Christian civilization. France, long feeble under her sluggish Merovingian kings, is beginning to assume some semblance of unity and a degree of real power under the vigorous guidance of the mayors of the palace, who at last take the name as well as the substance of royalty and found the illustrious Carolingian dynasty. In England the struggle between Saxon and Kelt progresses, but

the consolidation of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom is still in the future. Latin is still the accepted language in all the West for literary, legal and religious purposes, but the Babel of dialects shows some signs of yielding an outcome in later times of vernacular speech and letters. Especially in England is the work of Cædmon and Bede worthy of remembrance in laying foundations for Anglo-Saxon literature.

In the social order, or rather disorder, some forces are to be reckoned with. The kings and lords constitute the ruling class, where military success and personal prowess are the main ideals. There seems to have been as yet no mercantile and burgher class to speak of, and yet these must have existed in some forms, though weak and oppressed. The lower, or governed, class consisted chiefly of two elements: the barbarian followers of the chiefs and kings, rude, illiterate, rapacious; and the downtrodden and despoiled native peoples. In such conditions trade and agriculture could only exist as necessary to life, they could not flourish as elements of civilization. Between the governing and the governed classes there was the clergy, recruiting its ranks from both the others and thus forming a sort of cement—alas! often sadly untempered mortar—for the social fabric. Morals were in a deplorable state, and yet not utterly rotten and hopeless. Roman law lay at the basis of civic life, and yet there was much lawlessness and rapine and some superposition of barbarian usages and laws. The ordeal and torture were common, and the man who could not defend himself had not much chance for “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” At the bottom was the old social life with both its good customs and its decay and ruin; then there was the alluvial deposit of fresh barbarian soil with its rank weeds of violence and rapacity, and yet with its choice flowers of courage, honor and respect for woman; and above all was the influence of Christianity which, despite its own corruptions, served to mitigate the ills of the other two elements, and held in germ the hopeful formative forces of the better social order that was to come. The Papacy, now finally independent of the East, establishes its political power in Italy, and by its shrewd alliance with the Frankish kings strengthens itself for its growth and dominance in all the West throughout the Middle Ages.

2. GENERAL SURVEY OF PREACHING IN THIS TIME

Preaching, as usual, shared and to some extent reflected the character of the age. There were materials and qualities of it common to both sections of the church and world, but at the risk of some repetition it will be better to consider the East and West separately. All the old differences—ethnic, geographical, political, linguistic, doctrinal—remained and were emphasized by the new conditions, while still others were added. The preaching of the East has dropped into its conservative old age, and its general character shows little change for centuries; while that of the West, though in a sad decay, has in it latent forces destined to wonderful and varied development in the course of time.

In the Greek Church of this time there was no growth, but there was some ferment. In the seventh century the *monothelite* heresy—the doctrine that the person Christ had only one will though two natures—racked the church as had done the more famous controversies of the earlier times; and in the eighth the zeal of the iconoclastic—image-breaking—emperors and their followers tore church and empire in twain over the question of the reverence to be paid to pictures and relics.

Besides these controversies, which, of course, influenced the clergy and preaching of the times, other conditions affected for evil the sermons addressed to the people. Degeneracy and corruption infected both people and priesthood. Fanaticism was flourishing, superstition abounded. Angels and saints, images and relics received veneration which amounted to worship, while the special emphasis which had long been given to the worship of the Virgin Mother of Jesus becomes excessive. To her are transferred many of the attributes of her divine Son, and some of the events associated with his incarnation and birth are made to do service also in behalf of his mother. Thus her miraculous birth, her presentation in the temple, the doings of her parents are treated as historical and important. Christ is looked upon as the Judge and his glorified mother is appealed to as intercessor and mediator between men and his wrath. Festivals and saints' days abound, many of the sermons that have come down to us

are occupied with these, and were doubtless regarded as masterpieces and so preserved. Piety had fallen still further—if that were possible—into formalism, and Christian virtue into regard for churchly observances and requirements. What sort of preaching was to be expected under these conditions?

Theological thinking has almost gone. John of Damascus stands out in solitary eminence among the theologians of the age. He has no equal among his contemporaries or successors, and but few that may be compared to him at all. The exposition of Scripture is wretched. Allegory is gone mad. The clergy are ignorant as well as corrupt, the sermons show little thought and less learning. Harangues on the saints, the images, the festivals, and chiefest of all on the Virgin, take the place of the exposition of the word of God. Few of the sermons have texts, and the quotation and application of Scripture are often forced. Rothe¹ well sums up the situation thus: "The monkish spirit prevails. The dogmatic addresses almost wholly lack the didactic element. All moved about the idea of the miraculous and the incomprehensible, and the whole aim of the preacher seemed to be to awaken astonishment and admiration. To this end they were not ashamed to get material from the New Testament Apocrypha." As was to be expected, the style—bombastic, wordy, overstrained—fully corresponds to the content of these decadent homilies, and we look almost in vain for specimens of real oratorical power.

When we turn to the West we find a different and in some respects more hopeful state of affairs. It is sadly true that preaching is much neglected—perhaps even more than in the East—and the quality and contents of the preaching are no whit better than among the Greeks of the same period. But there are both circumstances and elements of preaching which are suggestive of better days to come, even though as yet the coming is far away. There can be no question that in all its history preaching was at its lowest stage during this period. But though languishing it was not dead, though very inferior in quality it was not wholly bad.

The chaotic state of European society during the sev-

¹ *Gesch. d. Pred.*, S. 158.

enth and eighth centuries was not favorable to preaching. Rude barbarian kings and lords ruled over church as well as state. The people were oppressed, many of them fearfully ignorant and corrupt. The clergy were often grossly ignorant, and sometimes immoral. Yet these very things appealed to devout churchmen and to enlightened statesmen as well, and earnest efforts were made to improve the state of affairs. About the year 762 Chrodegang, Archbishop of Metz, in his *Regula Canonorum* (c. 44) enjoins that there must be preaching, presumably in all the churches of his diocese, twice a month at least; and better yet on every fast day and Lord's day; and that the preaching must be such as the people can understand. In the *Capitularia*¹ of Charlemagne and his successors numerous regulations are found in regard to the character and duties of the clergy, and preaching comes in for its share of attention. These rules are found as early as the year 769. There is much insistence upon the duty of preaching, and even the material of the sermons is prescribed to some extent; as for example, priests are forbidden "to feign and preach to the people, out of their own understanding and not according to the sacred Scriptures, new or uncanonical things."² These efforts in the latter part of the eighth century reveal how greatly preaching had fallen both as to frequency and quality. We shall see later what effect these efforts at reform had upon the preaching of the following times.

Besides these praiseworthy attempts of the authorities to improve preaching there were earnest endeavors on the part of individual priests and monks here and there to gather the people together and preach to them. These missionary movements, though crude and imperfect, were a note of real life in preaching, and had in them the pledge of a fruitful future. We shall see more of this phase of preaching further on.

The clergy and preaching of the age have been very properly classified by historians into parochial, cloistral, and missionary. So far as the clergy is concerned the classification, though proper, cannot be rigid or exclusive. For sometimes, though very rarely, a parish priest or even

¹ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 97.

² Capit. of the year 789; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 97, col. 182.

a bishop, might do some missionary work, or be called on to preach in a monastery. But very frequently the monks preached in the parishes, were sometimes made prelates, and were distinctively the missionaries of the age. When it comes to preaching itself, however, the distinction is apparent enough.

Parochial preaching was that of prelates and priests in churches to the people gathered on Sundays, saints' days, festivals and other occasions. Strange as it may seem there was apparently less of this preaching than of the other kinds, and it was of poorer average quality. Many of the bishops and secular priests concerned themselves very little with preaching. Partly this was due to all the elements of decline which affected the preaching of the age, but more distinctively to the encroachment of liturgical worship and the cares of administration, which we have already seen growing in the preceding period.

Cloistral preaching, as the name indicates, was that done in monasteries, and consisted chiefly of instruction and exhortation to monks and nuns. It may be that persons from the outside were sometimes invited or permitted to attend some of these services, but the aim and character of the preaching was monastic. The preacher might be a visiting prelate or brother, or, very frequently, the abbot, or sometimes a brother appointed for the purpose. In case of the nunneries the preachers were usually the prelates under whose jurisdiction the institutions lay, or monks of the related orders deputed for the purpose. In far later days one of the most famous preachers of the Franciscans¹ began his career as a preacher to the nuns of the associated order. Sometimes these sermons were called "instructions," and sometimes "collations," from the fact that they were not infrequently given while the brethren were at their common meal in the refectory. Naturally the discourses were of a didactic and often of a mystical character.

In addition to the actual cloistral preaching we must take some account of the influence of monasticism upon preaching generally. For it was great and lasting. In the widest view there was the conceded value of the monasteries as refuges and preservers of learning in these evil

¹ Berthold of Regensburg, d. 1272.

times. The monks were taught in the cloistral schools what learning there was. Some of these schools and their teachers, even in this early age and yet more in later times, became and remain deservedly famous. The monastic clergy were commonly far superior both in morals and learning to the parish priests. From the monasteries went forth the best prepared men for the work of the ministry, and many a monk became a distinguished prelate. This was true of the great Spaniards Leander and Isidore of Seville in the preceding times, and of Ildefonso of Toledo in the period now under review.¹ Frequently the monks went forth to preach in the churches and also as missionaries, as we shall presently see more fully. In regard to the work of the monks in England Montalembert² gives this interesting account: "It is then to the monks, scattered as missionaries and preachers over the country, or united in the numerous communities of episcopal cities and other great monastic centres, that must in justice be attributed the initiation of the Anglo-Saxons into the truths of religion. . . . They were expressly commanded to teach and explain to their flocks, in the vernacular tongue, the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the sacred words which were used in the celebration of the mass and the administration of baptism; to expound to them every Sunday, in English, the Epistle and Gospel of the day, and to preach, or instead of preaching to read them something useful to their souls. . . . From this spring those homilies in Anglo-Saxon which are so often to be met with among the manuscripts in our libraries, and which are by several centuries of an earlier date than the earliest religious documents of any other modern language." Since the brilliant Frenchman's time some of these early homilies have been edited and published by English scholars.³

Missionary preaching had received its impulse from the work of Patrick and Columba in the preceding period.

¹ See Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, I., pp. 414-427.

² *Op. cit.*, Vol. II., p. 608.

³ See Cutts, *Parish Priests and Their People in the Middle Ages in England*, chaps. II., III., V., XIV., and especially p. 223 for remarks on the Saxon homilies, which, however, belong to a later date than the eighth century. We shall have occasion later to deal with the *Old English Homilies*, edited by Morris.

In this time it found noble expression in the labors of Columban, Gall, Wilibrord, Winfred (Boniface), and others. It appears that the parochial clergy did little or nothing of this sort of preaching, though the good work of Eligius of Noyon, who was never a monk, is a brilliant exception to this rule. The missionaries were principally monks.

As already intimated the character and quality of Western preaching in the seventh and eighth centuries must be rated lower than at any previous time. After the fall from Ambrose and Augustine to Gregory I. and Cæsarius of Arles, further decay would seem well nigh impossible. But still it is a fact. The bishops preached but little, the common parochial clergy even less; what preaching there was came mostly from monks and missionaries. The sermons are largely imitations, adaptations, compilations, and in not a few cases direct copies of the older discourses. The faults of other days are perpetuated in weak reproductions, no new note is heard, little power is shown; preaching is merely holding on to its traditions with a feeble grasp and waiting for better days.

In form the sermons are still the structureless hortatory homilies of other days. They are usually very short. The style is not uniform; quotations and imitations from older models preserve the manner of the later Latin fathers to some extent; and of course individuals differ in their use of the current church Latin; but the general inference from all this is in accord with the facts—there is no style to speak of at all, no strength, life, beauty, or eloquence.

In contents the Latin sermons are no better than the Greek. The Scriptural exposition is forced and allegorical, often helplessly puerile. Of deep and powerful thinking there are scanty if any specimens. Saints' tales and marvels, extravagant laudation of the Virgin and of relics are largely in evidence. Some gospel is preached, however, and the moral teaching is for the most part correct and earnest. The monastic and churchly virtues receive too great emphasis relatively to other things. We should remember, however, that accounts of the effect of preaching at times upon its auditors give us a better impression of its actual power than we are able to gather from the tame Latin reports of sermons which have come down to

us. There was doubtless both better and worse preaching than the preserved discourses exhibit.

Latin was the prevalent language of preaching. All the discourses of this time are preserved only in that tongue; the Anglo-Saxon homilies mentioned before belong to a later date, and there are none as early as those in any other of the nascent languages of modern times. But still, even in this early time—the seventh and eighth centuries—there are traces that at least some of the popular preaching was done in the vernacular dialects. Thus Bede¹ tells how King Oswald of Northumbria interpreted Aidan's preaching to his court, and how "Paulinus preached all day long to the people," presumably either directly or by an interpreter, and how Cuthbert "was wont chiefly to visit the villages . . . to allure the rustic people by his eloquent preaching to heavenly employments." In France, or Flanders, Eligius of Noyon, who will be noticed later, distinctly says in one of his sermons: "Therefore we address you in rustic speech (*rustico sermone*);" and in another, "Therefore we turn to you using a simple and rustic speech (*eloquio*)."² This is not perfectly conclusive, since it may refer to the bad Latin and harsh pronunciation of the common people as distinguished from the more cultured, but it is at least an indication of the use of vernacular speech in the Frankish countries in the seventh century. In Switzerland, as we shall see, there is reason to believe that Gall early in the seventh century made some use of the native dialects in his preaching. This interesting and somewhat difficult question of the extent of the use of the rising modern languages in the preaching of the Middle Ages will come up again and again as we proceed to follow the history, but this much concerning the earliest traces of such use it is proper to state here.

From this general account of the preaching of the two centuries under review we must proceed to give brief notices of some of the more important preachers of the age in both the Eastern and Western churches.

¹ See Cutts, *Parish Priests*, etc., pp. 21-24.

² Quoted by Cruel, *Geschichte der Deutschen Predigt des Mittelalters*, S. 9, who says: "The Latin language therefore belongs here, as in all similar cases, only to the written report, and not to the public delivery." This seems an allowable inference, but it should not be pressed too far for reasons mentioned in the text.

3. PREACHERS OF THE GREEK CHURCH.¹

There is no occasion for a classification of the Greek preachers of the epoch; but a few of the better known will be mentioned in their chronological order. Very little is known of Sophronius except that he was originally a Sophist, then a monk, and became patriarch of Jerusalem about the year 634. He was early and late a strong opponent of the Monothelete doctrine. Four sermons are ascribed to him, their subjects being as follows: (1) On the Birth of Christ; (2) Panegyric on the Angels; (3) and (4) On the Adoration of the Cross. They are declamatory in style and excessively panegyric in tone. For example, the cross is apostrophized and called on in a long prayer to show forth its manifold power.

A certain George of Pisidia comes into view about the year 640 as archbishop of Nicomedia, having previously been known as a deacon and librarian at Constantinople. From him we have some poetical and historical writings and nine sermons. They treat of the conception of Mary and of her mother; of the birth of Mary, and her presentation in the Temple; and of her being at the cross and the tomb of the Lord. They show the prevalent tendency to give to Mary not only some of the attributes and offices of her Son, but even to ascribe parallel facts to her birth and infancy. Some of the tales are taken from the Apocryphal writings. Besides these discourses on Mary there is a panegyric sermon on the saints Cosmas and Damian. Of the whole collection Rothe says: "All these addresses are empty declamations without content and without thought, overloaded with picturings, exclamations, rhetorical figures, and emphasis. They could only tickle spoiled ears, but not teach or edify hearts."

A man of more note is Andrew, who, toward the end of his life, early in the eighth century, was archbishop of Crete. He was born in Damascus, where his early education was received. About the year 635 he became a monk at Jerusalem, and must have lived there a long time, for

¹ For the following discussion the author is chiefly indebted to Rothe's *Geschichte der Predigt*, sections 57-63; though something has been derived from other authorities, and something also from the original sources as given in Migne's *Greek Patrology*.

at the council of 680, which condemned Monotheletism, he was the representative of the patriarch of Jerusalem. After the council he was kept at Constantinople, ordained a deacon, and put in charge of an orphanage, and later was made archbishop of the island of Crete. He was a man of considerable talent, being something of a commentator and also a hymn-writer. One of his hymns has become somewhat familiar to modern singers in Neale's vigorous adaptation rather than translation:

“ Christian, dost thou see them
On the holy ground,
How the powers of evil
Rage thy steps around?
Christian, up and smite them,
Counting gain but loss,
Smite them by the merit
Of the holy cross.”

As a preacher Andrew has perhaps better claim to notice than any of his contemporaries. Seventeen homilies are ascribed to him, but at least one and possibly others are of doubtful genuineness. They are characteristic of the times, being mostly concerned with Mary and the saints. (One of these whom he eulogizes is naturally enough his first predecessor as bishop of Crete—Titus! One of the sermons treats of the Transfiguration, one of the raising of Lazarus, two of the exaltation of the holy cross. His veneration of the Virgin is of the most extreme sort. According to Rothe “he calls her the diadem of beauty, the queen of our race, the holy temple of Christ, the rod of Aaron, the root of Jesse, the sceptre of David, the mediatrix of law and grace, the seal of the Old and the New Testament, the expected salvation of the heathen, the common refuge of all Christians, the restoration from the first fall, the bringing back of the fallen race to freedom from suffering, and much of the same sort.” But with all these faults there is a certain elevation of thought and expression, and certainly some oratorical power. He exhibits one peculiarity of the preaching of all this time, that is, putting extensive imaginary speeches into the mouths of Bible characters, the angels, and even God.

There meets us in this time the name of a certain Germanus, who is said to have lived about a hundred years (634-c. 734). He first appears as bishop of Cyzicus, then about 715 as patriarch of Constantinople. From this office he was driven into exile by the iconoclastic emperor Leo about the year 730, and died soon after. He was a zealous partisan of the image-worship, and is highly esteemed by the Greek church as one who suffered for his convictions. There remain from him a few religious poems and some other writings. Among these are a number of sermons, many of which are devoted to extravagant praise of the Virgin. In one of them is a long conversation between the angel Gabriel, the Virgin Mary, and Joseph, in which Joseph makes accusations against Mary and she defends herself. In another he declares that Mary soon after her death was raised again and taken bodily to heaven. The style is much like that of Andrew of Crete, and there is evidence of real oratorical talent.

By far the most important and interesting man of the mediæval Greek church is John of Damascus (d. c. 754, or later),¹ sometimes called by his Arabian name of Mansur, or Momsur. It is rather as a man, a theologian, a writer, than as a preacher that he is justly famous. Judged by his sermons alone he could not be reckoned among the great preachers of history, nor very far above his contemporaries, yet his greatness in the other respects mentioned makes him altogether the most notable Greek preacher after Chrysostom. His admirers have vainly sought to place him alongside the great Antiochene by surnaming him *Chrysorrhoeas*, "the golden current."

The story of his life, as accepted after his own times, contains miraculous and fabulous elements which throw some doubt upon that part of the narrative which is not of itself improbable. The accounts say that he was born in Damascus the latter part of the seventh century, the son of a Christian named Sergius, who served the Arab caliph as treasurer and stood high in the ruler's favor. John's education was received from one Cosmas, a pious and learned Italian monk, who had been captured by the

¹ The date lies between 754 and 787. His latest writing is of the earlier date, and his death is noted by the second Nicene Council in 787. Article in Herzog.

Arabs in a foray and sold as a slave at Damascus. Sergius ransomed the saintly man and set him to educate his own son John and also an adopted son called Cosmas, probably after the teacher. Both pupils did well, and John especially distinguished himself, learning grammar, philosophy, mathematics and theology. His father having died, John was appointed by the Caliph to high office. Now comes a highly wrought story from which it is hard to get the kernel of truth which probably lies within it. On account of his defence of the image worship, the emperor of Constantinople falsely, by use of a forged letter, informs the Caliph that John is a traitor; whereupon the Caliph has John arrested and causes his right hand to be cut off. John begs that the hand be left with him in the prison, and in answer to prayer the Virgin joins the hand back to the wrist during the night. The Caliph is overcome by this miracle, pardons John and wants to restore him to his office; but John refuses and leaves Damascus.

Whatever the cause may have been, John did leave his native city and the service of the Caliph and entered as a novice the famous monastery of St. Sabas near Jerusalem. Here it is related that the brethren had so profound an impression of his learning that none would undertake to be his teacher, until at last upon certain conditions an old and austere monk agreed to receive him into his cell as a pupil. We need not follow the details of his severe training in self-abasement. Finally, it is said, the Holy Virgin appeared in a dream to the old monk and bade him remove the restriction he had placed upon John's writing, as she had need of his talents in her service and that of the church. Henceforth his literary labors are great; his numerous writings show diligent activity. He was ordained a presbyter by the patriarch of Jerusalem, and was frequently called upon to teach and preach in the city. It is probable also that he preached upon occasion in other places. Thus with his writings and his preaching he spent the remainder of his days at St. Sabas, where he died about the middle of the eighth century.

His extensive writings embrace works on the image controversy, and on theology, some hymns, and some orations and sermons. His greatest theological work, "The

Fount of Knowledge," is a useful epitome of the Greek theology and is still an authority in the Greek Church. He used the Aristotelian logic, and is thus in some sense the pioneer of the great Latin schoolmen of a later age, who are much indebted to him. He wrote a number of hymns, still prized in the Eastern church; and it is a matter of interest that his adoptive brother and fellow pupil Cosmas was his companion and colaborer in this work.¹ Neale has put us in his debt by admirable reproductions of several of these, "The Day of Resurrection" being the best known.

John's sermons are not free from the errors of his time—forced allegorical interpretation, excessive veneration of the Virgin, highly wrought panegyrics on the saints. There is little of theological or moral teaching in them; they are unnecessarily prolix, but they are clear and forcible in expression and show the logical, scholastic bent of his mind. Such as they are, they served as models for later Greek preachers and found many imitators. An extract from his sermon on the withered fig tree may give a hint of his method. After a stilted introduction dealing with the incarnation he proceeds to say: "Wherefore then as he was partaker and sharer of the [divine] nature (for the nature of the Father and of the Son is one), so, as it were, he serves the will of the household and becomes man and is obedient to the Father even to death, and that the death of the cross, all for the purpose of healing my disobedience! He comes, then, hastening to suffer and hurrying to drink the cup of death, whence is the salvation of all the world. He comes hungering for the salvation of humanity, and finds not fruit in it—for this is what the fig tree, as in a parable, obscurely teaches." Then he goes on to develop this thought, repudiating the literal interpretation.

Theodore Studites (759-826) was born at Constantinople about the middle of the eighth century, and came of a good family. He had an uncle, Plato, who was abbot of a monastery and induced Theodore and other members of the family to take up the monastic life. Theodore became very ascetic and was highly esteemed by his brother monks. Against his wishes he was or-

¹ Schaff, *Ch. Hist.*, Vol. IV., p. 406

dained a presbyter in 784. He had trouble with the emperors both on moral subjects and in regard to the veneration of the images. He was several times banished, and often cruelly treated. From 797 to 802 he was in favor at court, and at the request of the empress Irene—the zealous champion of the holy *icons*—he became head of the famous monastery of the Studium at Constantinople. He reorganized this and made it the most renowned of all the Greek cloisters of the age. Hence comes his surname.

There remains from him a collection of a hundred and thirty-five short addresses to the monks, which are without text, mostly hortatory, and inculcating the monastic virtues. These discourses were very highly esteemed and were for a long time read in some of the churches in connection with public worship. Besides these homilies there are also sermons of all sorts on the much-used subjects of the day, the Virgin and the saints, the exaltation of the cross, and the like. They are wholly in the taste and manner of the age, full of superstitions, saints' legends, forced figures and empty declamation. However admired in their own times, they bring no good message to ours.

4. PREACHERS AMONG THE ROMAN CLERGY

Turning our attention now to the West we shall find it both proper and convenient to use the classification of parochial, cloistral, and missionary, although as already stated the distinction in case of the preachers is not so clear as in the preaching. Only a few of each group can be noticed.

Of those who represent the parochial clergy one of the best was the Spaniard Ildefonso (607-667), who was born at Toledo of parents of noble birth and rank. In his youth he was taught by the famous Isidore of Seville. Against his father's will he entered the monastery of Agali, which was the most noted one of that age in Spain, and was the seat of learning and culture. Here Ildefonso was for a long time resident, first as monk and then as abbot. He took prominent part in several synods, and was distinguished for the purity of his own character and for severe discipline of others. In 657 he was, reluctantly on his own part, made archbishop of Toledo.

He was a faithful bishop, but was sorely harassed by many trials and conflicts in that age of turmoil. Arianism and the hostility of the king were not the least of his troubles. He filled his high office for a little more than nine years, and died greatly esteemed by the Spanish Catholics.

His best known work is a treatise against three unbelievers concerning the virginity of Mary.¹ He was a most ardent upholder of all the exaggerated Catholic doctrines concerning the mother of our Lord. The treatise is highly rhetorical, not to say bombastic, in style, and gives us no doubt a better idea of Ildefonso's preaching than the doubtful sermons which are ascribed to him. His reputation as a preacher was considerable, and he must have had a fervid temperament and the oratorical fire; but if the writing on Mary is a fair specimen of his work he did not fall below many of the oriental preachers of the time in the excess of his adulation of the Virgin.

Decidedly one of the most engaging characters of this age was the Frenchman Eligius (588-658)², long a courtier of several of the early Merovingian kings, and in his later life bishop of Noyon in Picardy. He was born near Limoges of a pious family, and was well brought up from childhood. Apprenticed to a goldsmith, who had charge of the royal mint at Limoges, Eligius greatly distinguished himself by his fidelity and skill in his calling. Meantime he was constant in his religious duties, and—a truly remarkable thing for a layman in that age—a careful student of the Scriptures. After a while he left Limoges and went to Paris, then the capital of the Neustrian Franks. Because of his skill as a goldsmith, his honesty and excellent character, he became a great favorite with King Clotaire II. Eligius was not corrupted by royal favor nor by the accumulation of wealth. In outward things, such as dress and manners, he conformed for a time to the world about him. But this was for policy rather than liking, for in his heart he was unworldly, even ascetic. As soon as he could do so with prudence he began to show his real feelings in these matters, laying aside his costly clothing and dressing with exceeding plainness. He gave much to the poor; he

¹ Given in Migne's *Latin Patrology*.

² *Vita*, in Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 87, col. 478 ss.

labored for the spread of Christian knowledge, and on his journeys frequently spoke and gave instruction in the Bible as a sort of lay evangelist; he founded cloisters based on the strictest discipline. Thus in various ways he used his influence at court, his personal wealth, and his own time and efforts to advance the cause of religion as he understood it.

When Dagobert succeeded Clotaire as king he retained his father's affection for Eligius and reposed so much confidence in the pious goldsmith as frequently to consult him on affairs of state. This was naturally not agreeable to the more worldly courtiers, and least of all to the ambitious mayors of the palace, who were already rising to the power which later resulted in their usurpation of royal prerogatives and finally of the royal title. The next king, Louis II., was more under the influence of his mayor of the palace, and the removal of the good goldsmith from the court was the next thing in order. To the credit of all concerned let it be said that instead of murder or false accusation the happy expedient was hit upon of making Eligius a bishop and giving him a frontier diocese! So the good man was duly consecrated a bishop and assigned to a region in the northeastern part of France bordering on the Belgic provinces, later known as Picardy, with the town of Noyon as its chief city and the residence of the bishop.

Thus inducted into office the bishop of Noyon proved to be a capable and faithful prelate, discharging the duties of his higher trust with all the fidelity and diligence which had distinguished him in his active business life. Now also his former Bible studies and lay preaching stood him in good stead as a preacher, and his relations to the monasteries he had founded helped him in the administration of affairs in his diocese. He had need of his previous experience, for the difficulties and opposition encountered in his work taxed all his resources and courage. Sixteen sermons of somewhat dubious authenticity are ascribed to him.¹ They exhibit no originality of thought, but have a certain warmth and earnestness. The account of his life indicates that he preached much and believed in it. He sometimes used the "rustic speech," and preached to heathen as well as to his flock.

¹ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 87, col. 594 ss., adduced by Rothe.

Among those who preached chiefly to the monks, or whose remaining sermons at least are chiefly cloistral, the preëminent name in this period is that of the saintly Saxon monk Bede (672-735), or Bæda, whom history delights to honor with the title of Venerable. He was born in the north of England at or near Yarrow. In early childhood he was put into the monastery of St. Peter at Wearmouth, and later transferred to that of St. Paul at Yarrow. These monasteries and their neighborhood were the scene of his life and labors. His teacher, Benedict Biscop, was a wealthy nobleman who had turned monk and supplied the monastery with books. Bede was an apt and diligent scholar and became well versed in the Scriptures, in the Latin Fathers, and in other branches of current learning. When he was nineteen years old, though under canonical age, he was made a deacon, and at thirty was ordained priest. He was invited to go to Rome to study and be in line for preferment, he was offered the abbacy of his convent; but he declined both of these flattering offers and devoted himself to learning and to the work of a teacher and preacher. He was a great and much beloved teacher, and a voluminous author. His best known and most valuable work is his *Ecclesiastical History of the Saxons*, which has been for ages one of the most prized sources for the history of the early Saxon period in England.

As a preacher Bede was active and faithful, preaching mostly in the cloister, but also to the people. Of the extant sermons ascribed to him there are a great number,¹ but probably many of them are spurious. Being chiefly reports of sermons to the monks, they cannot be regarded as a fair specimen of his popular power. They are monkish and dry, and full of extracts from the Fathers, especially Gregory the Great. The Scripture exposition is, of course, allegorical, but in other respects fairly good. The style is clear and usually easy, with some warmth but not much power.²

¹ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 94, col. 9 ss.; and some translations in Neale's *Mediæval Preaching*, p. 2 ff.

² Here is a striking saying from his sermon on the Baptism of Jesus, where discussing John's unwillingness to baptize his Lord, he says: "Sed quia vera humilitas ipsa est quam obedientia comes non deserit, quod prius officium expavit humiliter explevit." Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 94, col. 59.

In Migne's *Patrology*¹ are given a brief account and some sermons of Ambrosius Autpertus (d. c. 779). The sermons are not certainly genuine, but they have some real homiletic merits, though afflicted with the usual faults of that age. Little is given as to Aubert's life. He was born in Gaul, but became a monk in the monastery of St. Vincent in Volturno, Italy. It is related that he suffered from an impediment in his speech, which was miraculously removed in answer to prayer, and that he became a fluent and eloquent speaker. He was made abbot of St. Vincent, and was evidently held in high esteem both as man and preacher. One of the sermons considered to be his is a rather striking discussion of cupidity. The preacher shows (on the basis of I. Tim. 6:10) that avarice is the root of all evil, hard to eradicate, the source of pride, idolatry, envy, oppression, robbery, and other sins; and yet the effort must be made to tear this evil root out of the life. He makes effective warning in conclusion, and exhorts to almsgiving.

There were a number of monkish missionary preachers in the age we are studying, but only the most famous three will receive notice in our necessarily brief discussion—Columban, Gall, Boniface.²

Columban (c. 540-c. 615), so called to distinguish him from the first Columba, who founded the famous monastery at the isle of Iona, on the Scotch coast, is also known as Columba the Younger, or Columba of Luxeuil, from the abbey he founded in France. The name means in Latin "a dove," and was probably given to or adopted by the first Columba as a distinctive surname, and came to the second from the first, most usually in the form Columban. He was born in the Leinster district of Ireland, was a fine, studious lad, and early entered the famous abbey of Bangor, where he studied till he was thirty years old. At that age he felt his call to go forth as a missionary and founder of cloisters to be centers of evangelistic labors among the rude and half-heathen

¹ Tom. 89, col. 1265 ss.

² Besides other authorities, and the sources, the author has used with great profit the able and satisfactory work of R. Cruel, *Geschichte der Deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter*, and the brilliant and scholarly but withal somewhat onesided and *tendential* work of F. R. Albert, *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland bis Luther*.

people of central Europe. About the year 590 he took with him twelve pupils as companions and went forth to labor in the mountain region of France and in Switzerland. He first established a monastery in the Vosges mountains at Anegratis. It was a wild and desolate country, and there was a struggle to maintain life. But after the first trials the abbey thrived and became so full of monks and pupils that Columban decided to move on and establish another at Luxuvium, the modern Luxeuil. Later still another was founded at Fontaines. All these were in the territories of the Burgundian kingdom.

From these cloisters as centers Columban and his pupils went forth to labor among the people for their conversion and spiritual training. After more than twenty years of earnest labors, having incurred the enmity of the famous Burgundian queen Brunhilda, of the king, her grandson, and of certain bishops, he was banished from Burgundy and went into Switzerland. Here he labored for some years under the protection of the Austrasian king Theodebert; but on the latter's overthrow by another branch of the Franks he went to Italy. Here, amid the Apennines, he founded his last monastery, that of Bobbio, the refuge of his last year of life and the scene of his death in 615.

None of Columban's sermons to the people have come down to us, but there have been preserved in Latin fifteen or sixteen addresses, mostly to the monks, called the *Instructions of St. Columban*.¹ Thus while he was a noted and laborious missionary, these sermons, or rather brief reports of sermons, belong to the cloistral class. They deal chiefly with the moral and saintly virtues. The first treats of the Trinity, the second of mortifying vices and attaining virtues, the third of hating the world, and of love for heavenly things, the fourth holds that a man must labor in this life in order to rest in the life to come, the fifth that life is not properly a *life* (*vita*), but only a *way* (*via*), the sixth that this life is like a shadow, and so on. There are in them some great moral truths and Scriptural ideas, many striking expressions, but of course there is much that is forced, allegorical, monkish, and unscriptural. The piety and earnestness of the man are manifest in his work.

¹ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 80, col. 229 ss.

The most famous of the twelve pupils who accompanied Columban from Ireland was Gallus (c. 550-640), or Gallun, whom we know best by his abbreviated name, Gall. He was of good Irish family and had been for some time a student of Columban's at Bangor before they together went to Burgundy. He was active with Columban in all his labors, and was most useful to him as an assistant. Gall was gifted in language and had learned while in Burgundy the so-called "Alemenic" tongue, the dialect of an influential branch of the Teutonic folk. It is probable that this language was understood quite generally in Switzerland, much of which was then known as Alemania.¹ When Columban was banished from Burgundy Gall went with him into Alemania, and was very active in labors among the people. The story goes that after the missionaries had settled at Brengenz on Lake Constance Gall one day preached a powerful sermon to the people in their own tongue, and while they were still moved by the discourse he broke in pieces and threw into the lake three idols that had long been objects of worship. It was a bold stroke and produced a lasting impression.

When persecution forced Columban into Italy Gall was prevented by illness from going with him. The elder man regarded the illness as feigned, or at least exaggerated, and was quite angry at leaving his favorite pupil and helper behind, so that he forbade Gall to conduct the services of the mass as long as he himself should live! However, Gall remained behind sick, but managed to reach in a boat Arbon, on Lake Constance, where he had friends who received him and nursed him back to health. On getting well he desired to resume his missionary and monastic life. So pushing on with a guide into the wild country, he established his cell at the place which to this day bears his name—St. Gall. Others gathered about him, and a flourishing monastery was founded. From this station he kept up his mission work till his death in 640.

In the year 615 Gall was invited to accept a bishopric at Constance, but declined, pleading the prohibition of

¹As is well known the French name for Germany is still *Allemagne*, and for the German language *allemand*.

old Columban, his master, against his saying mass! But he recommended for the place his pupil, John, a native of the country. On the consecration of John as bishop Gall preached a notable sermon in Latin, which John interpreted into the language of the people. It seems clear from the affair at Bregenz that Gall could preach very effectively in the tongue of the people, and his long sojourn in the country and labors among the natives make it incredible that he was not sufficiently acquainted with the vernacular to use it had he so desired. The explanation of the singular circumstance is perhaps rather to be sought in the considerations that as it was a formal occasion and Latin was the ecclesiastical language it was fitting that the churchly tongue should be employed, while to accommodate those who could not understand it, and at the same time to demonstrate his fitness for his high office, John turned the sermon into the vernacular.¹ The sermon is still preserved, its genuineness generally accepted by critics.² It is a decidedly interesting performance. Beginning with the fall of the angels and of man the preacher sketches the Bible history from Genesis to Acts, giving emphasis to the work of our Lord and making spiritual application throughout. The special lesson is that men should forsake their sins and heathen follies, and serve the true God. In the conclusion he "calls upon Christians now to live in accordance with their baptismal vow, to avoid sin, to do good, and to care for their own souls in view of the future judgment."³

Winfrid (680-755), whom we know best by his Latin name of Boniface, was born in Devonshire, England, of well-to-do parents. He was educated at Exeter and at an abbey called Nhutscelle, which by some has been identified with Netley.⁴ It is thought that he adopted his new name of Boniface on becoming a monk. He showed both diligence in study and aptitude for affairs. A longing for missionary life on the Continent seized him. So,

¹ See Albert, *Gesch. der Pred.*, Bd. I., SS. 52, 53. But he seems to me to infer more than is just against the use of the vernacular in Gall's ordinary preaching and in that of others.

² Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 87, col. 13 ss.

³ Albert, *op. cit.*, Bd. I., S. 57.

⁴ F. F. Walrond, *Christian Missions before the Reformation*, p. 81.

with the reluctant consent of his abbot, he went to Friesland to help his countryman Willibrord, who was laboring there as missionary bishop of Trajectum, now known as Utrecht. Winfrid found on arrival that the Frisians were engaged in a fierce war with Charles Martel, the famous Frankish mayor of the palace and "Hammer of the Saracens." As there was little prospect for missionary work for some time to come the enterprising young monk returned home. The abbot of Nhutscele had just died, and Winfrid was urged to accept the vacant post, but declined, and sought to carry on his missionary work in another way. He went to Rome and obtained a commission from the Pope as general missionary among the Germans. Now his real life work begins, in 719.

After working for a while in southern Germany (principally Thuringia) Boniface came to the conclusion that he could do better if he had the protection of the secular powers. Having previously secured a letter from the Pope to Charles Martel—the real ruler of the Franks in the name of the feeble Merovingian king—he proceeded to court to seek the protection of the powerful Frank. Charles readily granted his request, much to Boniface's joy. While at the Frankish court he had heard of the death of old Radbod, king of the Frisians, and armed with Charles' letter of protection he again went to the aid of his old friend Willibrord among the Frisians. He remained about three years in that country and then returned to resume his labors among the Germans in Thuringia and Hesse. After a fruitful year's work he made another visit to Rome, and was created bishop of Germany without fixed headquarters. Once more he sought and obtained the protection of Charles Martel, and from now on labored for some years among the Thuringians and Hessians, calling helpers from England, founding monasteries, preaching and working for the half-heathen people. It was during this time that he cut down with his own hands at Geismar a huge oak that had long been regarded with awe as sacred to Thor (or Woden, as some have it), one of the heathen divinities. In 732—the very year in which his mighty Frankish protector immortalized himself by defeating the Saracens on the plains of Tours—Boniface was made archbishop and pri-

mate of all Germany. His hands were now full with establishing churches and bishoprics, selecting men for offices, and generally settling ecclesiastical affairs in his vast territory. In 745 he was assigned to the archbishopric of Mainz, that his labors and responsibilities might be somewhat lessened in his old age. But after a time the old man turned over his affairs to another, and with the old dreams of his youth he turned once more to the heathen Frisians. In that wild country he received at the hands of a horde of the heathen his martyr's crown, being slain by a party of fierce men to whom he had come with the gospel of peace. Thus Boniface ended his labors in the year 755, though some authorities place it a year earlier.

Historians are not unanimous as to the merits of Boniface's work, nor as to the superior excellence of his character. The Catholic view is expressed in his well-known title of "Apostle of Germany." Extreme Protestants discredit his work, and in some degree his character. They make him bigoted, worldly, bent on subduing the Germans to the papal yoke, preparing the way for Canossa and necessitating the Reformation. As is usually the case in such matters, the truth probably lies between extremes.

There remain fifteen short, probably genuine, sermons from Boniface.¹ They are not missionary discourses, but are addressed to nominal Christians. Thus they seem, as has been well remarked,² to belong not to the first half of his life, when he was doing pioneer work, but to his later career of organization and discipline. It is hard to say exactly to what class of hearers they were given, or certainly in what language they were spoken, though of course we have them in Latin. They are without text, but often relate to the Scriptural lesson for the day. They use Scripture freely, but of course in the prevalent allegorical way. They borrow much from the older sources, and deal with baptismal vows, the Creed and Lord's prayer, the churchly virtues, and the like. As sermons and of themselves they are not of much value; but they deserve study as specimens of their

¹ Found in Migne's *Latin Patrology*, and discussed by Cruel, Albert, *et. al.*

² Cruel, *op. cit.*, S. 23.

kind, and as the remains of a very interesting and important man.¹

Our survey of the conditions and character of Christian preaching and of the lives and labors of a few of the best preachers during the seventh and eighth centuries justifies the title of this chapter. Preaching was indeed at a low estate. But still it was not gone from the earth, and, though depressed, it was not dead. The sketch we have made does not exhaust the subject. Besides those mentioned, there were many other brave and faithful men who, with imperfect equipment and in trying times, preached the gospel as they understood it to the people of their own days.

CHAPTER V

VOICES IN THE NIGHT; OR, PREACHING DURING THE NINTH, TENTH AND ELEVENTH CENTURIES

I. SKETCH OF THE AGE

The epoch included in this chapter runs from the death of Charlemagne in 814 to the beginning of the first Crusade in 1095. In the East there were not many events of general historical interest, but the old empire held together still. The accession of the empress Irene in 780 had been a turning point in the image controversy, and the second Nicene Council in 787 had declared in favor of the images. But after Irene some of the emperors had been iconoclasts, and it remained for another empress, Theodora, in 842, finally to settle the long strife in favor of the *icons*. The monks and the women gained the day at last. From 867 to 1057 a line of Macedonian emperors, including, besides others, Phocas, Zimisce, and Basil II., governed with some real ability and suc-

¹In Serm. I., *De Fide Recta*, speaking of pastors he says: "Quomodo docet quis quod non didicit? vel qualiter pastor esse poterit si pane vitæ gregem sibi commissum pascere ignorat? Non erubescat nesciens discere quod ignorat, nec sciens tardus sit docere quod novit." That last sentence has a suspiciously Augustinian ring, but let us hope it is original! At any rate the passage well expresses a very important principle.

cess. Then the family of the Comneni—Isaac and Alexis—reigned with a show of splendor, but in real weakness, toward the end of the eleventh century. The revival of the Roman empire in the West under Charlemagne was a final stroke to the pretensions of Constantinople in that direction—though any real sovereignty had long ago passed away. On the northeast there were struggles with the rising power of Bulgarians and Russians; and on the southeast the decay of the caliphs was offset by the rise of the Turks, and so the storm that was to bring destruction was already brewing.

In the West events pregnant with influence on subsequent history occur. The death of Charlemagne in 814, the division of his empire among his descendants, and the great settlement of the treaty of Verdun in 843, really founded France and Germany as separate monarchies and left Burgundy as an age-long apple of discord between them. Another step of great importance was the renewal of the empire under strictly German leadership in 962 by the able Otto I. This period also witnesses the incursions of the Northmen in different parts of Europe, especially important being the settlement of the Normans in France and of the Danes in England. The struggles of Alfred, the Danish supremacy, and at last, in 1066, the Norman conquest give to English history a memorable interest. The general expectation in Europe that the world would come to an end with the year 1000 produced both unrest and lethargy in the tenth century. But the relief from that foreboding and the agitation preceding the Crusades awakened the eleventh century, and a new era was about to dawn.

In ecclesiastical affairs the final schism between the Roman and Greek churches is accomplished within this period. The three decisive steps may be mentioned without discussion: (1) The establishment of the Western Empire by the Pope and Charlemagne gave to the papacy prestige and power; (2) The quarrel between Nicholas of Rome and Photius, the ambitious patriarch of Constantinople, resulted in their excommunicating each other about the middle of the ninth century;¹ (3) The final dispute between Leo IX. of Rome and

¹ Schaff, *Ch. Hist.*, IV., p. 275.

Michael Cerularius of Constantinople involved the differing points of doctrine and ritual, and also claims to jurisdiction over recent converts in eastern Europe, and resulted in the mutual excommunication of the churches in 1054.¹ This schism, however, was an affair of ages; the events mentioned only sharply emphasized what was already a fact. The conversion of Russia to the Greek church in the tenth century was an event of world-wide importance.² Count Vladimir, after some hesitation, accepted the Greek faith, married a Byzantine princess, and was baptized along with many of his people in 988. The story of the papacy during this epoch is full of shame and glory. Early in the tenth century began the so-called *pornocracy*, the reign of the harlots, when the see of Rome fell under the blighting influence of corrupt and ambitious women. Much confusion and turmoil went on all through the century till the election of Gerbert as Sylvester II. in 999 brought some little relief; but still riot and confusion disturbed the church, and at one time as many as three popes at once claimed the throne. Finally the emperor deposed them all, and in 1046 Clement II. inaugurates a better day. In 1049 the monk Hildebrand becomes chief adviser to Leo IX., and from then on till his own elevation as Gregory VII. in 1073, and his death in 1085, he brought the papacy to the height of its power and glory. It was a wonderful thing how the institution was brought up from its abyss of shame and made so great a power.

To trace the history of preaching through these dark ages is the task before us, and as the conditions East and West were so different it will be necessary, as before, to treat separately the Greek and Roman churches.

2. THE EASTERN CHURCH

Only a few general remarks are needed to put before us a view of the Greek preaching of the age, for there was no marked change from that of the preceding time—none for the better certainly, and it hardly could be for the worse.

¹ Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

² Stanley gives an interesting account of it in his *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, p. 284 ff (Scribners' pop. ed.)

In form the sermon is still rather the stately and pretentious oration. It treats of great occasions, and easily retains the exaggeration and bombast of previous ages of decline. It commonly has no text, but the usual themes for laudation. There are a few homilies of less pretentious character, but of no special merit.

In contents there is much sameness. Praises of Mary and the saints on their festivals are the chief material. Little or no doctrine, and only a little good moral exhortation occur. There is a dearth of strong thinking, of grappling with great themes. Grasp of fundamental Christian truth is traditional and feeble, and the application of truth to life is scant and weak. The disciplinary virtues find place, but large and live handling of moral issues is not prominent. The use of Scripture strikes one as more sparing than in former days, and of course the forced and allegorical interpretation is still dominant.

There is much dependence on the past, as the following quotation from Lentz¹ will show: "The free address came more and more into decay; men stuck to what was already at hand and chose especially the homilies of Basil the Great and St. Chrysostom for readings—a custom which lasted long. This was due to watchfulness for purity of doctrine which the church was careful to guard. Accordingly, as early as the Trullan Council, in the year 692, order was made that the bishops should daily, and especially on Sundays, teach religion to the clergy and laity through collections of sound doctrines of Holy Scripture, and that they should not pass the fast-set bounds and doctrinal prescriptions of the godly fathers. When any controversy arose as to the Scripture they must explain according to the 'lights and teachers' of the church, and thus they would win more applause than if they gave their own views."

There was continuous decline in the frequency of preaching.² The two chief causes were the ever increasing regard for the mass as being the essential thing in worship, and the growing ignorance of the clergy. More and more these deteriorated, and many were utterly incapable of preaching an original discourse. Such was the fallen condition of preaching among the people who

¹ *Christl. Hom.*, I., S. 132.

² Rothe, S. 202.

in this degenerate age still spoke the language and professed to revere the examples of Basil and Chrysostom!

A few of the best among the preachers from whom sermons have come down to us may be mentioned as samples. Of these the first is a certain Gregory (d. c. 817), who was born in the Isaurian Decapolis probably about 731, and served as bishop in that region. There remains under his name a curious and all but worthless address² known as "a historical sermon on a certain Saracen who had a vision, was converted, and afterwards suffered martyrdom." The address was a great favorite, and was much used as a declamation in the monasteries. A condensation of it may not be devoid of interest.

It tells how a Saracen officer on a journey with his retinue came to a temple consecrated to St. George and ordered his servants to drive the twelve camels into the temple and feed them. The horror-stricken monks protested in vain. But on entering the sacred precincts the camels all fell dead. The terrified Saracen had the carcasses speedily dragged away and then remained himself to witness the worship. When the mass was celebrated the man saw with astonishment and loathing that the officiating priest took a fair child and cut him into four parts, putting each part into a plate and pouring the blood into a cup. The assembled Christians all partook of this gruesome feast without apparent horror, but as though accustomed to it. At the conclusion, when the priest and others had eaten the consecrated bread that was left over from the distribution, the celebrant took off his robes and, coming to the Saracen, hospitably offered him some beautiful bread. This, the man learned, was the bread from which the consecrated loaf had been selected, whereupon he broke out into fierce words, calling the priest a murderer, a monster, and the like. The pious man was greatly shocked, but when the Saracen explained why he used the opprobrious names the priest's surprise became astonishment, and he said: "You surely must be some great one, for I and my comrades being only poor ordinary sinners see nothing in these elements but bread and wine, as types of the broken body and shed blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Nor have the holy lights and

² Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, tom. 100, col. 1201 ss.

teachers of the church, even such as the saints Basil and Chrysostom and Gregory, seen anything more than this." Whereupon the Saracen was converted on the spot and straightway demanded baptism, but the cautious priest, after telling him what was involved in the Christian faith, referred him to the archbishop, who dwelt far away at Sinai. The Saracen went to the archbishop, was duly instructed and baptized, and began the life of a monk. One day he asked the archbishop how he might see Jesus. The old prelate could not tell him, and the Saracen be-thought him of the holy priest in the temple of St. George, and repaired thither. From his old acquaintance he learned that the way to see Jesus was to go back to his kindred, publicly renounce Mahomet, and proclaim Jesus as his Lord and Saviour. The Saracen gladly obeyed these instructions, was promptly put to death for his boldness, and thus obtained the martyr's crown and the beatific vision.

The story is elaborated with considerable prolixity, and while utterly valueless in itself and as a sermon, yet throws a curious light on the taste and customs of the age with regard to some points of interest. It would be pleasing to dwell on these somewhat if space permitted, but the statement that even the "lights and teachers of the church" saw only the bread and wine as types, shows that this man at least had not gone very far in developing the doctrine of the Real Presence.

There was a Christopher (d. c. 836) who was patriarch of Alexandria in the first third of the ninth century. Little is related of his life. He joined with two other prelates in a letter to the reigning iconoclastic emperor in favor of image worship. He was long a sufferer from paralysis, and the active duties of his office were devolved upon an assistant. His interest for us lies in the fact that there remains from him a homily¹ which, in spite of its defects, is really worth preserving, and would be worth translating here entire, excepting its stilted introduction and needless, not to say foolish, digressions. But for these faults its literary excellence is considerable, the language being simple, and the interest sustained to the climax, while the moral lesson it conveys is of peren-

¹ *Pat. Gr.*, tom. 100, col. 1215 ss.

nial importance. Space forbids more than a brief presentation of its course of thought.

The homily is without text, but has this title: "A Soul-Profiting Exhortation Showing to What This Life Is Like, and unto What End It Comes." It is a sort of parable, with applicatory interruptions and other digressions, and runs thus: A man once took up his abode in a fine house, bringing his wife, his only son, his servant, and his other belongings. He was warned that in the house (this life) there dwelt a deadly snake (the demon of avarice), and he was urged at once to hunt out the reptile and kill it, which he was fully resolved to do. But when he came to kill the snake he found that it had left for him a piece of gold of the finest mintage. The man reasoned, "Surely this snake does not wish us any harm, or he would not have left us this piece of gold." So he let the snake alone, and day after day it brought the gold piece. After a while it bit the man's horse, and the animal died. The neighbors urged the man to kill the snake before he should do worse damage. He was about to do so, when the fatal coin again caught his eye and caused him to reason that with the fast accumulating gold he could buy another horse and still have much money left. So it went on as before, until the servant was bitten and died; then the son; then the wife; the man vowing vengeance, cursing the house, bewailing his lot that he ever came into it, in each case; but every time the bright, pure gold piece salved the sore, and plausible reasonings let the snake live on. By and by the man becomes a miser and gloats over his wealth, but suddenly one day the snake bites him and he falls very ill. No physician can cure him, but he prays to God and vows he will mend his life and kill that snake if only he be spared. His prayers are heard and he recovers, but when he goes to kill the snake he finds instead of the usual coin a magnificent pearl. Fatal sight! the fool hesitates, declares he will take better care and not let the snake bite him again. Once more, after many pearls are his, he is bitten; once more prays and vows; once more is spared; till at last God's patience is exhausted, the third bite of the snake is allowed to have its effect, and the wretch dies pleading in vain, condemned by the wise, justly getting the due

meed of his folly and sin. The homily concludes with suitable application of the lesson and with earnest exhortation to repentance. It is in refreshing contrast to the stock sermons of the age.

A certain George (d. 880), who was for a while keeper of archives in the great church at Constantinople, and later was bishop of Nicomedia, and a friend of the patriarch Photius, has bequeathed to us nine or ten worthless discourses in the bombastic style of the age. Some of the titles are here quoted from Rothe as illustrating the kind of thing which generally prevailed in his time: The Prophecy concerning the Conception of the Mother of God; Encomium on the Conception of St. Anna, the Mother of the Most Holy Mother of God; Oration on the Conception and Nativity of our Most Holy Lady, Mother of God and Perpetual Virgin, Mary. There are several more sermons on Mary and one on the saints Cosmas and Damian. They are full of exaggeration and padding of all sorts, and are destitute of any merit. Yet no doubt they were highly esteemed in their time.

The learned Photius (d. 886), patriarch of Constantinople near the middle of the ninth century and later, is chiefly celebrated for his quarrel with Nicholas of Rome,¹ which was one of the steps in the great schism. But he was also an author of repute in several fields,² and some of his works are of considerable value. He enjoyed a good reputation as a preacher. Of his sermons there are published in Migne's Greek Patrology³ two entire ones in Greek and two Latin fragments or abridgements. Others besides these are mentioned by scholars as existing in manuscript, but they seem never to have been printed—probably to nobody's loss! Of the two complete sermons one is on the birthday of Mary, in which the preacher remarks: "To-day is the Virgin Mother born of a barren mother, and thus the home for the Lord's sojourning is made ready." This was accepted tradition as to the mother of Mary, whose birth also had to be extraordinary. The other sermon is likewise devoted to the Virgin, having been preached at the dedication of a church built in her honor. They are of the customary sort, loose in con-

¹ Schaff, *Ch. Hist.*, IV., p. 312 ff.

² *Id.*, p. 636 ff.

³ Tom. 102.

tents and treatment, full of digressions and padded with fables and the like.

All three of the preceding preachers belonged to the ninth century. Rothe declares that in the tenth century no Greek preacher is worth naming, and we may as well accept his judgment and pass on to the eleventh century, which may be dismissed with brief mention of two only.

Theophanes Cerameus (d. 1052) was archbishop of Taorminia in Sicily, and died about the middle of the eleventh century. From him have come down sixty-two homilies, which are said to be rather above the common run of mediæval Greek sermons. In fact Rothe¹ praises them as being simple in style and free from tawdry declamation, interpreting and applying the text with some skill.

The noted commentator Theophylact (d. c. 1107), who was quite a scholar and a teacher of one of the young emperors, has left us several sermons or addresses, but they follow the fashion of the age and in themselves are said to be unworthy of mention. The sun of Greek pulpit eloquence has long set.

3. THE WESTERN CHURCH

In the countries which owed ecclesiastical allegiance to Rome the history of preaching up to the end of the eleventh century went on upon the lines developed in the epoch last studied. Notwithstanding the earnest efforts of Charlemagne and his successors to improve preaching by legal enactments, there was no great improvement. These efforts themselves reveal a bad state of affairs, for laws on morals are usually in advance of attainment. That the laws continued to be made shows that the evils were not remedied, but still that interest in the reform persevered. No doubt all this gave impulse toward a better state of things, but from the nature of the case the evils could hardly be mended by law. There was needed a new spiritual impulse, a reform from within, and this did not come. Then the decay and division of the empire contributed to the failure of these well-meant reforms, and preaching continued to be much neglected

¹*Gesch. der Pred.* S. 204; and this judgment is endorsed or adopted by Christlieb in Herzog, supplement to Bd. 18.

and of poor quality. On the other hand, however, we must remember that the neglect was not total, any more than in former times. Parochial, cloistral and missionary preaching still went on, and remaining sermons as well as narratives of events still teach us something of the character of the work done.

The missionary work of this age was considerable. In the East, as we have already seen, Russia was attached to the Greek church; and before that, in the ninth century, Cyrill and Methodius, two brothers, had done an excellent work among the Slavs in Moravia. Though Greeks themselves, their converts became connected with the Roman church, but in a somewhat independent way. The missionaries had learned the native language, preached in it, translated some of the Scriptures into it, and secured permission for it instead of Latin to be used in worship. But through political and ecclesiastical rivalries and divisions this good work did not endure, though some fruit came of it. In the West proper much activity went on among the half-Christian population in the lands that had already been brought nominally into the fold, and, in addition, Norway and Sweden, Denmark, the Baltic provinces, Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, all in some measure received the Romish form of Christianity during this period. It was the "dark ages," but the gospel light though burning low was not quenched.

Coming to consider more particularly the preaching itself in these dark centuries we shall find it convenient to discuss in order the clergy, the people, the language used, and the character and contents of the sermons during that age.

The Roman hierarchy was considerably developed. In 1059 the Roman cardinals—a designation which originally included "all the clergy attached to one particular church"¹—were created a college of electors to choose the pope, and the term "cardinal" is henceforth restricted to these, though after the thirteenth century the Roman cardinals were appointed from other countries as well as from Italy. Archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons, constituted the stated orders of clergy, but there were numerous other officers and titles. Monasticism

¹ Kurtz' *Church History* (Am. ed.), Vol. II., p. 59.

had powerfully influenced the clergy. Some of the abbots had episcopal rank and authority and were called "mitred abbots." Many monks were ordained deacons and priests and were called "regulars," because they lived by monastic rule (*regula*), while the ordinary parochial clergy were called "seculars," as living out in the world (*saeculum*). Other monks were novices, pupils, lay workers. There was much of rivalry and bad blood between the "regulars," who claimed superiority in character and learning, and the "seculars," many of whom no doubt were shamefully ignorant and loose.

Of course there were learned and good men among the clergy of all orders, but the average character was discreditably low. The superior clergy had a good degree of ecclesiastical, social, and even political influence, and many of them fell victims to the vices of avarice and luxury. In fact the whole class was more or less infected with vice; simony, gluttony, avarice, sensuality, flourished among them. While the monks may have been in most cases better than the "seculars" there is painfully abundant evidence that they, too, were often corrupt and vile. Besides moral degradation there was among the clergy much gross and inexcusable ignorance and superstition.

The nobles, the clergy, the common people, were then as long afterwards the three classes of society. The middle class, strictly speaking, had not yet arisen. The clergy, still as in former times, being recruited from both the other classes, for social as well as official reasons made a sort of connecting link between the upper and lower orders of people. Among all classes there was much superstition, immorality, ignorance, violence; and yet the finer virtues of humanity and the noble ideals of the Christian faith were held in honor, and there was much piety of a sort. As to the arts and comforts of life not much can be said; there were feasting and luxury in the upper walks of society, but the exactions of the clergy and the rapacity of the nobles left little more than bare living to the common man. Under such conditions there was evident and sore need of preaching, but it had much to do if it would attain and keep a tolerably decent average of excellence, and even this, alas! it failed to achieve.

Scholars are somewhat divided in opinion as to whether

before the twelfth century there was, properly speaking, any preaching in the vernacular languages of continental Europe.¹ It is generally agreed that although there are evidences of Anglo-Saxon preaching long before this time, the rule certainly in cloistral and prevailing in parochial preaching, was to use the Latin as the churchly and universal tongue; that no sermons earlier than the twelfth century (except in Anglo-Saxon) are preserved to us in any other language than Latin; and that the use of Latin in worship and preaching was persistently prevalent into even later times.

But in favor of there having been at least some preaching in the vernacular the following considerations are urged: (1) That the fact of preservation in Latin does not prove that many of the sermons were not *delivered* in the language of the people, for Latin was the language of literature, and especially theology, and all *writings* would naturally be in that tongue. (2) Missionary preaching must have been largely if not altogether in the vernacular, either directly or by an interpreter; and there are positive statements and other indications which establish this view.² (3) There are laws and regulations from Charlemagne's time and onward which plainly prescribe that at least some preaching must be given to the people in their own tongue. The clearest case is that of a canon passed by the Synod of Tours in 813 which distinctly says: "And that each [preacher] shall strive to translate the same homilies [written in Latin] plainly into

¹ The point, as regards Germany, is ably discussed by Rothe, Cruel, Albert, in the works so often cited, and by scholars to whom they refer. For French preaching the admirable work of M. Lecoy de la Marche, *La Chaire Francaise au Moyen Age*, considers the question more especially in reference to the thirteenth century, but the learned author shows that there are indications of vernacular preaching in French before that time. He notes, however, the variant opinions of French scholars, and confesses the difficulty of the question.

² For the cases of Eligius of Noyon and of Gall, see pp. 146, 150, 151 and Lecoy de la Marche, p. 237, who quotes the following epitaph on Notker, d. 998:

*Vulgari plebem, clerum sermone Latino
Erudit, et satiat magni dulcedine verbi.*

Magni is probably misprint for *magna*. Here we see the contrast distinctly made between the language used for the people and that for the clergy.

the rustic Romance or German tongue, in order that all may the more easily understand the things which are said." ¹

On the other hand some seek to break the force of these weighty considerations by urging, (1) that the non-existence of dialect sermons cannot be overcome; (2) that the indications from "preaching" to the people in the vernacular are inconclusive because the word often meant only reciting the creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the like; (3) that the seeming exceptions only prove the rule; and (4) that the laws and canons show the lack of vernacular preaching and vainly sought to institute it. But this looks too much like special pleading in the interest of a theory. The truth probably lies between extreme positions either way; and there was probably some missionary and popular preaching in the vernacular, though as a rule, always in the cloisters and generally in the churches, the preaching was in Latin.

As to the character and contents of the sermons that have come down to us from that age little needs to be said. The preaching was much as in former times; the best part of it was borrowed from the older preachers, and it was filled with legends, with discussions of the churchly virtues, and the like, to the obscuration of the simple gospel. As a consequence it could not have had much influence on the life of the people. Church services consisted largely of the liturgy, especially that connected with the celebration of the mass, and very little of direct appeal to conscience and thought. After the deep darkness of the tenth century there were some tokens of a better time. The rise of scholasticism about the middle of the eleventh century and the preaching of the first Crusade toward its close were both tokens and causes of a coming revival which was to show itself in the twelfth century, and to reach its height in the truly wonderful preaching of the thirteenth.

As we have seen, the classification of preachers as missionary, parochial and cloistral still holds. The age had no distinguished preachers, though there were not

¹ Et ut easdem homilias quisque aperte transferre studeat in rusticam Romanam linguam aut Theotiscam, quo facilius cuncti possint intelligere quae dicuntur. Quoted by Rothe (S. 184) and others.

wanting in all the classes earnest workers, capable prelates, and learned divines. Some of the best and best known will be selected for brief sketches.

The most distinguished missionary preacher of the age was Ansgar (801-865), who was born of Frankish parents near Amiens and educated at the famous monastery of Corbie. After teaching a while at the twin German cloister of the same name (usually written Corvey) he accepted a call to go to Denmark as missionary. He established a mission in Schleswig in 827. He was especially kind to the poor and needy, and his zeal as teacher and preacher was marked. But the king, who had patronized the good missionary, became unpopular, and was forced to leave the country. Upon this Ansgar also found it best to retire; but a way was opened for him to enter Sweden, where he spent two years in teaching and preaching. In 831 a bishopric was established at Hamburg for all the northern country, and Ansgar was made the first incumbent of the see. The king of Denmark captured Hamburg, plundered the city and burned the church. It seemed as if Ansgar's work was all ruined; but he did not forsake the field, and better times came. Bremen and Hamburg were united, and he was made archbishop of the enlarged diocese. From Bremen as a basis he gradually resumed work both in Denmark and Sweden, and at last met with larger success. He worked on, a saintly and faithful man, to the end of his life in 865. It is known that he preached much and effectively to the people, but no sermons of his have come down to us, and particular estimate of his preaching is therefore impossible.

Among the preaching prelates of the age none stands higher than the renowned teacher and leader Rabanus, surnamed Maurus (c. 776-856). He, too, was of good French family, was born at Mainz and carefully educated at the renowned abbey of Fulda. For a time he was sent to Tours to be taught by the famous Alcuin, but returned to Fulda and became teacher there. He was ordained deacon in 801, priest 814, elected abbot of Fulda 822, resigned 842, consecrated archbishop of Mainz 847, and retained the office till his death in 856. He was eminent as teacher, scholar, author; was a diligent bishop, and

withal an active and popular preacher. He both preached much himself and encouraged others to preach.

While at Fulda he wrote at the request of Aistulph, archbishop of Mainz, a collection of homilies. They were to be used in private reading and also by the priests who should read or reproduce them in preaching. Some extracts from his introduction follow:¹ "In obedience to your commands I have composed a book of sermons to be preached to the people on all subjects which I consider necessary for them. . . . But since I could not, through the variety of my occupations, publish all these at one time, but as opportunity allowed sent them separately to you, I now request you to have them collected into one volume. . . . And this I would principally request as my recompense, that whenever you give this work to pious persons either to read or to preach you would desire them to assist my frailty by their prayers to the most righteous Judge, that I may by His grace for a long time run the course of the present life, and may merit to attain happily to future blessedness." The sermons are not remarkable either in thought or style. They are greatly wanting in originality, being largely borrowed from the fathers and earlier preachers. In one he inveighs against the still surviving superstitious custom of raising a great noise during a lunar eclipse, and inserts in the midst of his own remarks a paragraph, without altering a word, from a sermon by Maximus of Turin² on the same subject! This collection contains seventy sermons, and there is a later one which has a hundred and sixty-three discourses. This is thought³ to have been more especially designed for private reading. The earlier one is the more important. The discourses deal with the fasts and feasts, but also in a striking way with the sins and errors of the times.

A fellow-student of Rabanus both at Fulda and Tours was Haymo (c. 778-853), who also taught awhile at Fulda. Later he was abbot at Hirschfeld, and from 841 to his death bishop of Halberstadt. There goes under his name a collection of a hundred and fifty-four homilies. Most of them consist of extracts and compilations from

¹ Quoted from Neale's *Mediæval Preaching*, p. 30.

² See *ante*, p. 123.

³ Cruel, *op. cit.*, SS. 57, 58.

the older church writers. Albert¹ considers them rather as pious extracts designed for private reading than as actually delivered homilies. There is no originality. The collection is a compound of quotations, ridiculous allegorizing of Scripture, exhortations to the churchly virtues, treatises on fasts, saints' days, and so on. They are of no value except as illustrating the taste and habit of the age in preaching.

A like man, of later date, was Fulbert (d. 1029), born probably at Chartres about the middle of the tenth century. Bishop Odo took him up when a boy and trained him for a churchman. He was put to school at Rheims, where he was taught by the celebrated Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II. Recalled to Chartres Fulbert taught various subjects—grammar, music, dialectic, medicine—and had among his pupils the subsequently famous Berengar of Tours. He was a notable teacher and was sometimes called the "Socrates of the Franks." In his writings he defends already the view of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, which long afterwards received the name of "transubstantiation," and in the method of his theological treatises there are suggestions of the coming scholasticism. Fulbert was never a monk, and was made bishop of Chartres in 1007. Here he had no bed of roses, but was involved in the troubles of his times. He was a diligent bishop, and enjoyed a good repute as a preacher; but, in the judgment of critics, the sermons that we have from him do not sustain his reputation. They are, as usual, largely compilations filled with allegorizing and excessive veneration of the Virgin in the style of the Greek preachers. For example, he emphasizes the widely spread view that Christ is to be regarded rather as Judge, and therefore the intercession of his human mother is needed by penitents.

The name Ælfric belongs to several Anglo-Saxon churchmen of this period, but especially three are worthy of note: (1) an archbishop of Canterbury (996-1006); (2) an archbishop of York (1023-1051); (3) a certain learned Benedictine monk of contemporary date known as the "Grammarian." Whether the last is a third man or is to be identified with one of the archbishops is a

¹ *Op. cit.*, II., S. 116.

question.¹ Probabilities seem rather to favor his identification with the archbishop of York. He was a very learned teacher and greatly beloved man. In addition to his own work as preacher he translated many Latin homilies into Anglo-Saxon, and thus was not only a leader and founder of English preaching, but was also one of the fathers of English prose. As homilies these discourses hardly rise above the level of their age, but, as Schoell remarks, they are "a pure model of the beautiful Saxon mother tongue, and on that account alone are of the highest significance."

We may fitly close these sketches by the mention of two distinguished monks and prelates of the eleventh century who have left us cloistral sermons.

Peter, called Damiani (1007-1072), was born at Ravenna, the youngest of a large family. His education was provided for by his elder brother, Damian, whose name in grateful recognition of this generosity Peter ever afterwards attached to his own. He early became a monk, and in that very corrupt age was notable for his piety. He boldly denounced the current abuses and in various ways, by precept, regulation and example, sought to reform the morals of the clergy. He was a steadfast friend and ally of Hildebrand in this sorely needed work. He was made a cardinal, then papal legate at Milan, charged to correct disorders in that ever somewhat independent diocese. This post he soon resigned, worn out by conflict and worry. An address which he made to the angry clergy and people when papal legate at Milan is preserved and shows both boldness and eloquence.² He lived more quietly after this, writing and working in the monasteries, and died peacefully of a fever at Faenza in 1072, the year before his friend Hildebrand was made pope.

Of his sermons seventy-two remain.³ They have the faults with which we are already familiar as characteristic of the time—copying, allegory, excessive veneration of Mary—but they show some real oratorical talent and much sweetness of spirit and piety, without much origi-

¹ Schoell, in Herzog, I., S. 185.

² There is an English translation in *The World's Greatest Orators*, Vol. III. (G. P. Putnam's Sons); also some discourses in Neale's *Mediæval Preaching*.

³ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, discussed by Rothe and others.

nality or profundity of thought. Neale¹ rates them very highly, thinking them the best of the age until we come to Bernard; but Rothe's judgment is not so favorable and is nearer the truth.

The great theologian Anselm (1033-1109) was born in northern Italy, the son of parents of some rank. The father was a harsh man, with little sympathy for the boy's predilections toward piety and the church, but the devout mother, Ermenburga—worthy to be named with Nonna, Anthusa, and Monica—brought up her son with studious care; and though he early lost her, he never lost the impress of her teachings and character. After her death the lad found his home intolerable and left it, making his way over the mountains to the monastery of Bec in Normandy, where his famous countryman, Lanfranc, the scholar, was abbot. Lanfranc was high in the favor and councils of William of Normandy, and was appointed by the Conqueror archbishop of Canterbury. Anselm's life singularly followed that of his master, for in process of time he, too, became abbot of Bec, and later, under William Rufus, archbishop of Canterbury. In this office he so stoutly maintained the church's privileges against the arrogance and greed of the king that he was banished, though afterwards recalled. He lived till 1109.

It was during his banishment that he wrote his immortal treatise on the incarnation and atonement of our Lord, called *Cur Deus Homo*—Why God-Man? His greatest distinction is as a theologian, both on account of this treatise and two others, the *Proslogion* and *Monologion*; and he is rightly regarded as the most potent force in beginning the scholastic theology, though Lanfranc and Fulbert of Chartres had previously given it some impulse. Anselm was a great thinker, and a pure and simple-hearted man. His resistance to William Rufus, though on the wrong side as we now see it, was not prompted by pride or ambition, but was the fruit of conviction; for he held the strengthening views as to the papal prerogatives.

As a preacher Anselm did not rise above his times. It is disappointing to find his sermons so distinctly inferior to his great theological works. Sixteen of his homilies

¹ *Mediæval Preaching*, p. 54.

have come down to us. They seem to be mostly if not entirely addresses to the monks. They are in the nature of running comment—old-fashioned homilies indeed—upon the Scripture for the day. They show no special eloquence, nor much originality or profundity of thought. Allegory, of course, prevails as the mode of Scripture interpretation, and there is a trace of scholastic method here and there. The opening paragraph of his homily on Our Lord Walking on the Sea gives a specimen of his method:¹ “*And straightway Jesus constrained his disciples to get into a ship, and to go before him to the other side, while he sent the multitude away.*” In this lection, according to its mystical interpretation, we have a summary description of the state of the Church from the coming of the Saviour to the end of the world. For the Lord *constrained his disciples to get into a ship* when he committed the church to the government of the apostles and their followers; and thus *to go on before him unto the other side*, that is, to bear onward towards the haven of the celestial country, before he himself should entirely depart from this world. For with his elect, and on account of his elect, he ever remains here until the consummation of all things; and he is preceded to the other side of the sea of this world by those who daily pass hence to the land of the living. And when he shall have sent all that are his to that place, then, leaving the multitude of the reprobate, and no longer warning them to be converted, but giving them over to perdition, he will depart hence that he may be with his elect alone in the kingdom. Whence it is added, *while he sent the multitude away*; for in the end of the world he will send away the multitude of his enemies, that they may then be hurried by the devil to everlasting damnation.” Thus he proceeds verse by verse, giving special attention to the walking on the sea and the sinking and rescue of Peter.

Our survey of preaching, both in the Eastern and Western churches, during these three dark centuries leaves us with a feeling of depression. It was mostly weak imitation or straightout copying from the past; it had in the West very little and feeble use of the vernacular; in both sections of the world it dealt largely in fables of the

¹Quoted from Neale's *Mediæval Preaching*, p. 80.

saints, in extravagant and utterly unscriptural laudation of Mary as almost the equal of her divine Son; it laid more stress on the monastic and churchly than on the real Christian virtues; it emphasized the merit of penance and other works, and failed to make prominent the atoning work of the Saviour. Altogether the preaching of the gospel was at its lowest stage during the dark ages that extended from the death of Gregory the Great in 604 to the beginning of the Crusades in 1095. Yet some of the sermons preserved from that time show us that though weak and neglected, preaching still had some power in the world for good, and was able both to preserve and to perpetuate itself, notwithstanding the most serious external hindrances and internal decay. The beginning of the scholastic theology, the sweep of religious feeling aroused through Europe against the infidel desolators of the Holy Land, the yet unexhausted missionary impulse that had been one of the chief redeeming features of the ages of darkness, the reaction from the extreme depression of the tenth century, and the rise of the living languages of Europe as means of literary and religious expression, all are the faint gray streaks of a coming dawn. "The darkest time is just before day."

PERIOD III

THE CENTRAL MEDIÆVAL, OR SCHOLASTIC, AGE

1095-1361

From the times of Peter the Hermit and Pope Urban II. to the close of Tauler's (d. 1361) and the beginning of Wiclif's (ord. 1361) Preaching

CHAPTER VI

HERALDS OF THE DAWN IN THE ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH CENTURIES

The hints given at the close of the last chapter indicate the beginning of a new era in the history of civilization, of Christianity, of preaching. Towards the end of the eleventh century the forces of this new stage of human progress are gathering strength, they gain in power during the twelfth century, urge the movement to its height in the thirteenth, while in the latter part of that and first half of the fourteenth century the wave recedes to make way for another of different character and results. The period, then, on which we enter in this chapter (1095-1361) may be called the core or center of the Middle Ages; and while its limits are assigned from the point of view of the history of preaching, they yet include events and movements of vast significance in general history. This coincidence is not accidental; it only means that the total life of any great epoch must contain and influence each separate manifestation of that life, and that preaching has shared with other elements of European civilization the quickening impulses and gathered results of this momentous age.

Of the whole period the present chapter takes in only a fraction of the eleventh century and all of the twelfth.

A few observations on the general history of this time will somewhat prepare the way for a study of its preaching and preachers.

I. GENERAL SURVEY OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY

The division of Charlemagne's dominions, and the establishment of the territorial power of the pope in Italy, had shattered the ideal of having one great Western Empire, and left the struggling germs of three great nations to come slowly toward their separate organic lives. These were Italy, Germany, and France. The only one to reach a real national unity in this period was France. In the eleventh century the forces working toward the separate nationality of these different peoples were more or less active. The languages were different. Italian and French were forming themselves on the basis of the Latin, but the rough German preferred its forest ancestry and repudiated the softening touch of the classic speech. The peoples, too, were at bottom different. Frank upon Gaul was a different cross from Lombard upon Italian, and Teuton was not crossed save with itself.

In Britain, which was never under the New Empire, but with the departure of the Roman eagles had pursued her own course, there was even a more distinct development. The Briton had gone down before the conquering Saxon, and now, in the eleventh century (1066), the Saxon must accept the Norman conqueror, and a new turn is given to the language and institutions of England. Such was the national outlook in the end of the eleventh century.

In this time the political aspect of Italy was simply chaotic. In the eleventh century the Normans had established themselves in Sicily, and for ages that island and the southern end of the peninsula constituted dukedoms and kingdoms under various dynasties and nations. In the north the Lombard kingdom gave way to city republics, and these to family governments. Besides these the great cities of Genoa and Venice rose through commerce to wealth and independence, and were fierce rivals in trade. In central Italy fair Florence advanced step by step to power and renown. None of these discordant states could offer to the Italian people a strong centre of attraction.

The brilliant attempt of Arnold of Brescia to establish a republic at Rome ended in failure and the death of the premature patriot.

With abundant differences of detail and of national character the political affairs of the German people present a singular parallel to those of Italy, not only in the special period under our present study, but for a longer time. The revival of the empire under Otto the Great in the tenth century gave some hope of national and imperial unity; but while France was now politically separate from the empire, distracted Italy offered constant temptation to conquest, and the shadowy phantom of universal European empire still beguiled the fancy of the German kings. Thus Italy and Germany mingle their own discords into a larger din of utter confusion, and the patient ear of history waited long before hearing the first full notes of harmony. But when we turn our attention to the other two nations we shall find a very different state of affairs.

After the division of Charlemagne's dominions France, as a country, nation, and government, pursued its own line of development. The keynote of its political progress for centuries, including the central mediæval period, was the struggle for royal power. There was a king in name, but he was only the weak, nominal overlord of powerful vassals, several of whom singly were richer and stronger than he, and over whom as a whole his authority amounted to nothing. In the twelfth century Philip Augustus made substantial progress in reducing the power of the great feudal lords and extending his own. After his return from Palestine in 1191 he pressed this policy to the end of his life in 1223, gaining much territory from the English possessions in France and in various ways weakening the nobles. With him the monarchy in France became rich.

Very different from that of her continental neighbors was the political history of England during this great epoch. Like France, she developed a strong national life and government, but her monarchy tended to limitation and not to despotism. The Norman Conquest in 1066 made the king and his nobles the governing class in the country. But the Saxon love of liberty was to be reck-

oned with always, and the hot Norman blood of the barons was not to be too hastily stirred by royal tyrannies. By these three forces the political development of the English people was mainly guided. The first Norman kings were tyrants in character, but could not always be in fact, and many of the Plantagenets were very able and wise rulers, who knew how far they dared go in the assertion of kingly power.

Among all these peoples, alike in many respects while so unlike in others, there grew during the eleventh century a firmer grasp on life, less dependence on a decayed past and more assertion of conscious strength, reaction from the depression and darkness of the tenth century, more hopefulness and vigor in all the lines of human effort. In the sphere of thought the work of Lanfranc, of his distinguished follower Anselm, and of others of like mind, was laying fast and solid the foundation of that mighty fabric of theological and philosophical dialectics which trained and exercised for three hundred years the best human intellects—scholasticism. In religion the reformatory work of Hildebrand, beginning about the middle of the eleventh century and pursued with ardor all his strenuous life, had awakened the active sympathy of men like Peter Damiani and was bringing forth fruit meet for repentance in the lives of priests and people. Along with this there was among the masses of these nations a nascent sense of power; and at the same time in all classes a consciousness of moral and spiritual lowness and need.

On this gathered fuel fell the spark of eloquence which kindled a wondrous flame of partly religious, partly superstitious, partly political, and wholly adventurous enthusiasm which, in spite of repeated dampers, flared up at intervals during nearly two hundred years, and only flickered out at last from sheer exhaustion. In 1095 at a great council at Piacenza ambassadors appeared from Alexis Comnenus, emperor of the East, calling attention to the menacing and destructive attitude of the Saracens, and begging for help against these violators of the Holy Land. Pope Urban II. heard with sympathy, and the council favored giving the help. But there was not quite enough enthusiasm about it, and Urban, himself a French-

man, adjourned the council and called another at Clermont, in France, later in the same year. Here his eloquent appeal stirred the audience to a frenzy of enthusiasm. The people, too, were aroused by the preaching of Peter the Hermit and others sent out by Urban, and after a while the first Crusade was started. This is not the place to follow the long and checkered story of these expeditions. It took two centuries of costly failure to teach the West its lesson.

But during this time Europe was undergoing great changes and getting ready for the beginning of her modern course of development in civilization, which was to come by way of the Renaissance and Reformation several centuries later. The mighty though misdirected efforts of the Crusades had stirred the minds of all classes of the people, from kings and nobles to burghers and peasants. All elements of life were touched with a new breath, and so we shall find that with the Crusades, preaching, too, entered a new phase.

Yet it is, of course, in the realm of church and religion that we find the largest area of contact between the general life of the period and preaching. Some knowledge of general religious conditions as then existing is therefore essential to a good understanding of the preaching of the time; but as the discussion of the pulpit will bring out many of the details of religious life, it will be necessary here only to notice a few of the salient features of the history.

The death of Gregory VII. in 1085 closed a remarkable career and a most important era. The reforms he had carried within the church, and the claims he had asserted for it, left the papacy at the highest point it had yet reached in power and influence. The eloquent championship of the first crusade by Urban II. was another step in realizing and exhibiting the power of the pope in Europe, and also was an addition to papal prestige in that the principal part in the early crusades was borne by the Latin nations, friendly to the papacy, and not by Germany, its rival. Other things that helped on the ascendancy of papal power were: the great extension of canon law, that is, of the jurisdiction of the church in causes of various sorts; the rise and extension of orders of monks more directly amenable to the pope than to the

bishops ; and the great influence of men like Bernard and others who were its devoted adherents.

The Concordat of Worms in 1122 was a compromise between emperor and pope on the long-standing controversy over investiture, that is, whether the prelates in any country should be appointed to office by the pope or the national sovereign. It was against the interest of the civil government that officebearers of so great influence as bishops and higher prelates should hold directly from a foreign power ; it was against the interest of the church that its highest functionaries in any land should hold office by appointment of the temporal power. The question was vital ; the only real settlement of it could be in the supremacy of one or the other authority. A compromise could only prolong the real feud under seeming peace, or veil the actual power of one of the parties by apparent concessions to the other. The Concordat was such a compromise ; it gave to the pope investiture by ring and staff—the symbols of spiritual leadership, to the king appointment by the sceptre, the token of royal authority. The incumbent could not be fully in office without both acts, and thus if (as was usually the case) the royal appointment followed the papal, the king held a veto on the pope's appointments. This and other things left the way open for endless disputes. Yet the Concordat did give something of a breathing spell. But soon the struggle between pope and emperor broke out again, and this time it was the death struggle. The Guelf party, favoring the pope, and the Ghibelline, favoring the emperor, kept Italy and Germany in turmoil for many years. The hard-headed Adrian IV.—the only Englishman ever made pope—offered a firm and successful resistance to the great emperor Frederick Barbarossa. At the turn of the centuries (1198-1216) the greatest of all the popes—Innocent III.—was in the chair. In him the papal power reached its zenith.

In the life and character of the clergy, the moral and religious state of the people, and some other matters vitally affecting preaching, the conditions were so much the same as those which more distinctly and fully characterized the thirteenth century that detailed consideration of these points is deferred to the next chapter. It is quite time for us to come to the preaching of the twelfth century.

2. PREACHING IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY

Although the Crusades put the old Eastern Empire and the Greek church more in contact with the West than had been the case for ages, we do not find that this contact (or anything else!) galvanized the corpse of Greek preaching. We may as well here, once for all, dismiss the consideration of it for the time included between the end of the eleventh century and the Reformation. In all this time there was of course preaching; and some sermons and the names of some of the more important preachers have come down to us. But the sermons—many of them yet unprinted and accessible only in manuscript in certain libraries—have nothing remarkable to offer. They are of the conventional type of decayed Greek preaching. Some of the preachers, as John Caleca, Gregory Palamas, George Scholarius, and others are more or less known to historical and theological scholars, but scarcely beyond those limits.

In the West, however, a very different state of things meets us.¹ Here there is at the end of the eleventh century and through the twelfth a distinct improvement in the power and effect of preaching, though as yet not very much in contents. It will be well to pay attention to the signs and causes of this revival.

As France was the leading country in Western Europe during this age it is natural that we should find there

¹ The works which have been principally used in the preparation of the following pages are: *La Chaire Française au XII^{me} Siècle*, par M. l'Abbé L. Bourgain; *La Chaire Française au Moyen Age*, par M. Lecoq de la Marche; *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland bis Luther* (especially Bd. II., *Die Blütezeit der Deutschen Pred. im M.-A.*), von F. R. Albert; *Der Heilige Bernhard und sein Zeitalter*, von A. Neander; *Geschichte der Deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter*, von R. Cruel; *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland von Karl dem Grossen bis zum Anfang des 15ten Jahrhunderts*, von A. Linsenmayer (Catholic); *L'Oratoria Sacra Italiana nel Medio Evo*, da Luigi Marengo; *Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century* (Vol. II. of these in *Publications of the Early English Text Society*), edited, etc., by R. Morris. These will be referred to simply by the name of the author in each case. Many other works, including, as far as was practicable, the sources, have of course been consulted, and general reading has left its impressions in many cases where minute acknowledgment is impossible.

more than elsewhere the evidences of a revived interest in preaching. In other lands, too, there is heightened interest, and indeed throughout the Western European countries there can be no doubt that the darkest ages of preaching are now in the past.

Speaking summarily, we may say that the leading tokens of the revival are two: (1) There is a greater regard for preaching on the part of the clergy themselves. The shameful neglect of the past centuries begins to be redressed, and the mediæval Christian Israel suffers no longer so great a dearth of "teaching priests." Much remains to be done, many faults to be corrected, but there is hope of better things, yea, better things have already begun to be, when the preachers themselves magnify their office. (2) The other token of revival is the converse of this; it is that the people of all classes begin to show more respect for the real preacher and more interest in his message. It is true that scant respect is due, and scant respect is shown, to the still too numerous preaching officials who deserve not the name of preacher. But where a man like Bernard, or Fulco of Neuilly, or, among the so-called heretics, one like Henry of Lausanne, appears, the admiration and love of the people are abundantly in evidence. The very opposition occasionally roused by the preacher showed how great was the power of his word. The bad priests sometimes endeavored to stop the good ones, even using personal violence; and the loose and wicked among the people once in a while raised persecution against the brave men who denounced their sins. Bourgain well says¹ that the popular and worthy preacher was thus exposed to the double peril of persecution by his enemies and overpraise by his friends. Alas! it is one of the perennial perils of a fearless and able ministry. But the fact shows that preaching was no longer to be despised. Moreover the greater crowds which now began to attend popular preaching show this quickening of general interest in the work.

When we attempt to find and state the causes which led to this revival of interest in preaching we are met by the difficulties natural to such inquiries, and yet we may not decline the task. From the point of view of the Chris-

¹ Pp. 8, 9.

tian faith the one great cause lies hidden in the unrevealed designs and movements of Divine Providence, and in the mysterious and gracious workings of that blessed Power of whom the highest authority declares:¹ "The Spirit breathes where he will, and you hear his voice, but know not whence he comes and whither he goes; so is everyone that is born of the Spirit." From the point of view of history and philosophy the deeper cause lies beyond ken in that mighty law of ebb and flow, action and reaction, which directs, yet with no perceived regularity, the course of human affairs. The rhythmic action of this great law is detected in all those larger and nobler activities of man which for lack of a more accurate designation we may call spiritual: the realms of literature² and art, of science and philosophy, of statecraft and commerce, of manners and morals, of religion. Even when we admit the mystery of this great law of up and down, of forward and backward, and attempt only to detect and name what we are pleased to call "proximate causes," we cannot always be sure of our ground. For sometimes we call causes what are in fact effects, accompaniments, symptoms.

Yet, bearing in mind these greater and deeper causes, we may go on to present those more evident events and movements which seem to account for the marked revival of interest and power which we observe in the preaching of the twelfth century. In general it may be said that this revival was one element or part of that quickening of life which was felt throughout Europe in this age. And more especially we may distinguish and emphasize the following five things: (1) The reforms instituted by Gregory VII. among the clergy must have had weight. To be sure there was much yet to be done; but a more earnest spirit of devotion, a better life, and a higher regard for preaching as a part of their work seem to characterize the clergy at the beginning of this time. Always when the preachers themselves have a proper conception of their work, and live more nearly up to the standard which their exalted office requires, preaching will be more

¹ John 3: 8—perhaps the most probable meaning.

² For an interesting discussion of how this law has worked in German literature see W. Scherer, *Gesch. der Deutschen Literatur*, SS. 19, 20.

earnest and more fruitful. (2) Along with this spiritual quickening among the clergy must be reckoned also the intellectual revival which expressed itself in that form of philosophical thinking in theology to which the name of scholasticism is given. The rise of this mode of thought, especially among the clergy, has already been noticed, and will be more fully discussed later on;¹ but it must here be reckoned, with all its shortcomings, as one of the most potent causes and accompaniments of the revived preaching of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. When the preachers—even the few, the leaders—think profoundly on religious themes there must be a heightened tone in preaching. (3) Another potent cause, noticed by both Catholic and Protestant writers,² was the work of the so-called heretics. Many of these in the twelfth century were thinkers of no mean order, and one of the ways they took to disseminate their views was by preaching among the people. This stirred the Catholics to use similar means to meet what they considered dangerous errors. All through this century and the next, preaching for and against heresy is very common. Scholasticism represented religious thinking in the schools, heresy among the masses. Both stimulated and influenced preaching. (4) We must repeat that the crusades were a powerful factor in stimulating preaching. This they did not only by the general stir they produced, and not only by the partially religious character of the enthusiasm they awakened, but more especially and directly by the use they made of popular preaching. The oral address, whether by an Urban before the princes at Clermont, or by a Peter the Hermit, or a Raoul the Ardent among the people, was the means employed to arouse the masses. After these first preachers came Bernard and others to preach the later crusades. It was not exactly preaching—in the proper sense of the word—but it was the urging of men to immediate self-sacrificing devotion to what was believed to be a religious cause. It appealed to religious motives—at least in part—and thus it revealed and utilized the power of religious eloquence over the masses of men. So, while we well might wish that the object had

¹ See below p. 231 ff.

² Linsenmayer, Bourgain, Broadus, and others.

been more truly Christian, the motives purer, and the methods more enlightened, it is yet true that the proclamation of the crusades was a mighty and a permanent step forward in the development of popular preaching. (5) Another notable cause in making the preaching of the age powerful was the increased and more effective use of the language of the people. We have already seen¹ that in the preceding age the national languages were forming, and were coming into competition with the Latin as means of preaching. Now, just when the proclamation of the crusades called for effective popular address, this tendency shows marked advance, so as to make this epoch the transition period to the general use of these languages in the sermons of Europe till in the sixteenth century the triumph of the vernaculars is complete. But this important matter, besides being a cause of revival, requires fuller notice as marking one of the most interesting features of the age.

Whatever differences of opinion may divide scholars as to the use of the popular tongues in the preaching before this time, it is generally admitted that in the twelfth century these languages were widely if not generally employed in the sermons addressed to the people.² Lecoy de la Marche has shown that in the thirteenth century the French tongue was chiefly used in preaching to the people in France; and that this usage rests upon a custom growing faster and firmer from preceding times. Other writers have followed the same kinds of investigation for other countries and have reached assured conclusions. The twelfth century therefore witnesses the widespread and firmly fixed, though not yet universal and exclusive, use of the native and living languages of Europe in the pulpit. But granting this, there are several related questions which require to be noticed.

Have we any sermons now remaining in the twelfth century forms of modern European languages? In Italian

¹ See above, p. 165 f.

² So for France, Bourgain and Lecoy de la Marche; for Germany Cruel, Linsenmayer, and for the twelfth century, Albert; for Italy Marengo and Zanotto (*Storia della Predicazione nei Secoli della Letteratura Italiana*); and for England *The Old English Homilies*.

there seem to be none.¹ In German there are a great number.² In French there seem not to be many published collections, but Lecoy de la Marche and Bourgain have studied and reported a large number in manuscript which they found in libraries and collections. In English the *Publications of the Early English Text Society* contain volumes edited by Dr. Morris of *Old English Homilies*, dating from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. These sermons in themselves, as we shall see, are of little value, but to the students of language, literature, and theology they are relics of inestimable importance.

Another question—chiefly of literary and philological interest—relates to the state of the languages themselves as compared with their modern descendants. It is only necessary to remark on this point that by the twelfth century the native tongues had already acquired distinctive character and a considerable degree of firmness. There are various literary remains from this age which are highly prized by students and lovers of literature. It is for us a matter of no little interest to find that in that nascent literature of Europe preaching had a place of its own, and has sent on to modern times specimens of its contribution to the general sum. The preacher, as well as the poet and historian, had his place in guiding and fixing the linguistic development of European literature.

The remaining question to be considered is, What was the relation between the Latin and the vernacular languages in the uses of the pulpit? It is rather a complicated question. We must bear in mind several facts. One is that the Latin was actually used in spoken sermons not only in the twelfth century, but much later, along with the growing use of the national tongues. On this point it is of course impossible to determine and express with any precision the exact proportion of use; but it is quite evident that as the employment of the other languages increased that of the Latin declined.

Another fact is that by far the larger proportion of all

¹ Marengo, cap. I., says that there is one Italian sermon which may date from the twelfth century, but as the first one he is sure of belongs to the fourteenth, the point is not settled.

² Linsenmayer, S. 245 ff.; Cruel, S. 146 ff.; Albert, I., sec. I; all of whom refer to a number of collections made by other German scholars.

the sermons that have come down to us, not only from the twelfth century, but from the entire Middle Ages, are in Latin. Some of the earlier writers on the history of preaching, as well as some later critics, have been led by this fact to suppose that most of the sermons of the middle centuries were actually delivered in Latin. But the excellent work of Lecoy de la Marche and others has shown that the fact can be easily explained. The explanation is that many of the sermons which were delivered in the common tongues were written in Latin. This was sometimes done by the preachers themselves, either before delivery as sketches or notes, or after preaching as abbreviated reproductions. Sometimes the sermons were reproduced by hearers from notes taken on the spot or from memory. They were written in Latin because that was still the language of writing, of publication, of culture, the common medium of European scholarship. A man would have more hearers when he used the common tongue, but more readers when he used the Latin. The educated disregarded the common tongue as unsuited to writing. It is recalled that Dante, even in the thirteenth century, was minded to write his great epic, as he had written his great treatise on government, in Latin, but for some reason did use the Italian. As for the common people, few if any could read either language.

The next matter of importance for us to consider is the preservation of sermons. And here several items claim attention. First of all we have to make the obvious remark that the most of them have not been preserved at all! This is true of every age, and was no less so of the twelfth century. Many of the preachers of these sermons are now unknown, some have left a reputation for eloquence, but no specimens; while some have left specimens, but, unhappily, no eloquence. Nor is this beyond explanation. For even to-day many of our most effective preachers never get their sermons printed, and the printed sermons of many others are not fair specimens of their power before an audience. Our criticism of any age, as of our own, must on this account be cautious; and it is no wonder that the homiletic remains of the twelfth century hardly convey to us a just idea of the actual and effective preaching of that stirring time.

Another item of interest—already briefly noticed in another connection—is that we have from this age numerous collections of anonymous sermons—some in Latin, some in German, in French, and in English. One of the peculiarities of mediæval preaching—from the time of Charlemagne onward—was the preparation and employment of *homiliaries* or collections of sermons for the use of the clergy. They might use them as models and guides, or might commit and recite them, or, in extreme cases, might read them. This plagiarism was not considered a fault—it found early and authoritative justification in something that the great Augustine had written! Both Rabanus Maurus and Paul the Deacon in the preceding times had made these collections, and the work went on for ages.

The striking thing about the sermons found in these collections is their strong family likeness, their lack of individuality, of originality. When we compare the Latin and English sermons with the criticisms of the scholars who are familiar with those found in the German and French collections we see that these homilies have much the same character in all. The reason lies chiefly in the fact that they are mostly compilations and reproductions of older authors. Among these the prime favorites¹ seem to have been Augustine (or what was reported to be his work), Cæsarius of Arles, Gregory the Great, and Bede—the last-named, as we have seen,² being largely a compiler himself.

These collections, then, give us a saddening view of the dependence and tameness of the twelfth century preaching, but we must qualify this judgment by remembering what has just been said about the many unwritten sermons that stirred the age, and also by taking note of what is now to be said about those whose authors are known to us.

For we have also from the twelfth century a large number of authentic sermons. Many of these have the faults of the anonymous ones, but they show, as is natural, more individuality, more original force, more freshness. These sermons exist, for reasons given above, mostly in Latin; but there are some in French, and one

¹ Linsenmayer, SS. 193, 194.

² See above, p. 147.

of the German collections is ascribed to a certain Conrad the Priest, of whom Albert¹ says, "To the priest Conrad belongs the honor of having left the most important collection of sermons [in German] before Berthold of Regensburg." We shall see more of these later on.

The form and contents of twelfth century sermons offer a curious and not unprofitable subject of study, which has received suitable attention at the hands of the scholars whose excellent leadership we have been following. These sermons did not reach the excellence of ancient times nor that of the following centuries, but they begin to show improvement upon the immediate past. The old form of the simple expository and hortatory homily was retained. There was not so much attention to arrangement and division as we shall find in the sermons of the thirteenth century, but already this tendency to a more logical structure and penetrating analysis begins to show itself. This appears in the sermons of Bernard, X who sometimes announces his plan of treatment in advance of discussion. He is considered by some to have introduced, or at least to have improved and popularized, the analytic method, and thus to have set the fashion for all following times. Others, as Broadus,² assign a pre-eminence in this direction to Antony of Padua in the thirteenth century. Both these great popular preachers only used, developed and set going a tendency which was native to the time, which we shall hereafter more fully notice, as it came to its height in the next century—that is, the scholastic method. And it naturally finds a more complete application in the hands of Antony than of Bernard, who was influenced by its beginnings and not its full growth.

Along with this growing fondness in the contemporary mental attitude for logical analysis we must notice the fact that the teaching of homiletics was not neglected in this age. Not only was there probably oral teaching on the subject in the schools for clerical education,³ but there were numerous homiletical helps provided. These, as we have seen, were partly in the way of sermons or homilies already prepared, and thus were injurious rather than

¹ Bd. I., S. 9.

² *Hist. Prea.*, p. 103.

³ Mentioned by both Cruel and Linsenmayer.

helpful. But along with this there were numerous treatises which taught the art of preaching.¹ It is true that these treatises themselves show little originality or power, but the use of them was at least favorable to a better rhetorical practice. And this practice so far shows itself in many of the sermons that Bourgain² is led to a too enthusiastic estimate of the rhetorical facility of the preachers of the time, saying that many of them "seem to have known Fénélon³ in advance."

As to other matters of rhetoric, style did not so much differ with individuals as is common. This is accounted for by the use of homilies, imitation, copying and the like. The style of these homilies is usually tame, but unpretentious and clear. With vigorous men like Raoul the Ardent and Bernard there is of course less of the commonplace and a more pronounced individuality in the style. In some of the sermons there is a turgidity and laboring after effect which reminds us of the later Greek preachers. In others plays upon words, and rhymed prose, or *assonance*, are much sought after. The use of illustration, especially legend and anecdote, was frequent, but not always very clever. Albert⁴ calls this whole time the "narrative period" in preaching, from the liberal use of narrative as compared with argument, exposition, and doctrine. Yet he says that it is impossible to declare any one method to have been dominant. As the material was gathered from many sources so were the forms of discourse.

The use of Scripture in the sermons is much as we found it in the preceding ages. How could there be improvement upon the past with such wholesale borrowing from the past? The *pericope*, or reading for the day, often furnishes the basis for the sermon. Sometimes another text is taken and the *pericope* is handled in the discourse; sometimes no text is taken; and sometimes sayings of the Fathers, or even passages from the liturgy, are used as texts. In the sermons there is much quotation of Scripture, but it is often inexact, and oftener still misinterpreted

¹ For full and critical discussions of these see Cruel, S. 244 ff., and Linsenmayer, S. 85 ff. ² *Op. cit.*, chap. II.

³ I. e., his famous *Dialogues on Eloquence*, 17th century.

⁴ Bd. II., sec. I, 2.

and misapplied. The interpretation is of course still allegorical, if possible even more absurd than in former times. Centuries must pass before the pulpit could be delivered—and even yet is not wholly delivered!—from bondage to this ancient and intrenched abuse of Scripture. This was to be expected in the traditional homilies, but even original and powerful men like Bernard are not free from it. Ambrose and Augustine had got it from the Greek Alexandrian school, and the Roman clergy for centuries followed and carried to extremes the methods of these and other revered teachers of the ancient church. For example, Samson, who rose in the night and carried off the gates of Gaza, was a type of our Lord, who rose from the grave and triumphed over death. Gideon's fleece was a prefiguration of the Virgin Mary. Thus: The fleece was wet, and all the earth was dry; before our Lord's birth and during his infancy Mary alone had the treasure and all the earth had him not: then the fleece was dry and all the earth was wet; in his manhood and death Mary was bereft, but all the earth had the Saviour.¹ One of the preachers went so far as to say that "he who does not understand the Holy Scripture and the deep sense of it *otherwise than according to the words which are there written*, to him it tastes no better than if he chews and eats unthreshed and unground corn."²

On the whole, with regard to the use of Scripture, the Catholic critics,³ while admitting faults of interpretation, are far more lenient toward the mediæval use, or rather misuse, of Scripture than are the Protestant writers. For the latter point of view Albert⁴ very well sums up the case as follows: Theoretically the Bible was recognized as the source and foundation of preaching. But the following great errors show that in reality it had less influence than in appearance: (1) The use of extra-biblical material as Biblical, that is, the Fathers of the church and legends; (2) Gross and wilful errors of interpretation and application; (3) Extreme use of allegory, even to the point of teaching things contrary to Scripture; (4) Frequent lack of any text at all.

In general the doctrinal and moral teachings of the

¹ Albert, sec. 3.

³ As Linsenmayer and Bourgain.

² Id., sec. 4.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, sec. 4.

twelfth century preachers were, from the Catholic standpoint, Christian and sound; and with much of the teaching Protestants find themselves gladly in accord. But, on the other hand, there is, of course, much, both in principle and detail, which from a true Biblical standpoint must be regarded as erroneous and hurtful.

We have just seen that ostensibly the Bible was accepted as the source of teaching, but that in many ways it was departed from or misapplied. Also the great central Christian doctrines were proclaimed and urged, but in many points they were misunderstood, obscured, perverted. Thus the doctrine of the Trinity was accepted, but often there was little if any distinction made between the Persons of the Godhead.¹ Christ is presented as truly divine, and as the only and all-sufficient Saviour; but often his glory is obscured by dwelling on that of Mary and the saints, and his atoning work is overshadowed by wrong teaching as to the merit of works and the intercession of human and glorified mediators. The sinfulness of man and his need of repentance and faith in order to be saved were insisted upon, but repentance too easily became outward penances, and faith a mere acceptance of the church creed. The future life was taught in both its phases of punishment and bliss, but this was mingled with unscriptural teachings as to purgatory, and with other more or less harmful errors. One of the curious teachings, which came indeed probably from a hint of Augustine's, but was much insisted on and used in this time, was that God's purpose in the creation and then in the redemption of man was to fill up the gap which had been made in the heavenly hosts by the fall of the angels. Much attention is paid to the angels, and also to the reality of Satan and his aids. Perhaps the greatest error, which the Catholic writers praise as a glorious truth, emphasized by these sermons, is the adoration of the Virgin. The extravagances of the preceding period² had become the settled doctrines of the twelfth century. In one of these homilies Mary is represented as the fishing line and Christ as the hook and the bait. The hook represents the divinity whereby he strangles the devil, the bait represents the humanity whereby he attracts and saves us! Such stuff as this is, alas! only too common.

¹ Albert, *ib.*, sec. 5.

² See above,

Excepting the errors as to penance and merits and related details, the moral teaching of the sermons is usually satisfactory—Biblical, Christian, strong. Sins and virtues are strongly depicted and vividly portrayed in their contrasted natures, effects and recompenses. Vice is not glozed over nor weakly denounced, wherever found in nobility, clergy, or people. And so, making all necessary allowances and subtractions for errors, perversions and faults of every kind, the sum of our findings as to the doctrinal contents of these sermons would be that, upon the whole, the great essentials of Christian faith and life are presented in them; and that he who would intelligently and sincerely take their teachings to heart would find the Lord Christ as his Saviour, and heaven as his eternal home.

As to the times and subjects of preaching, the latter were often determined by the former, so that sermons on the regular days of the church year—Sundays and feast days—were called *sermones de temporibus*; and those in commemoration of the saints were called *sermones de sanctis*. Besides these there were special occasions, such as dedications, meetings, funerals, and the like. Within these general limits, of course, the particular subjects of the sermons would be determined by the nature of the occasion, the lesson for the day, the choice of the preacher, and so on. The hour by preference was early in the forenoon—apparently sometimes preceding, sometimes following the celebration of the mass. But other hours were also sometimes used, according to circumstances. The place of preaching was of course generally the church or the cloister chapel, but the popular preachers often addressed the crowds in the open air in town and country. The audiences varied both in character and size with circumstances—whether in church or monastery—whether a special or ordinary occasion—whether a popular or dull preacher—as always! Audiences were not always very orderly. Preachers complain of inattention, going out, sleepiness and the like, in well understood fashion. Bourgain tells of one preacher who seems to have had a drowsy audience, and he quietly remarks, “That sleeping man over there in the corner is going to miss the great secret I have to tell, if he doesn’t wake up.”

It had the desired effect. Men and women usually sat apart. There seems to have been difference of custom in regard to posture. Some of the references in the sermons plainly indicate that the people were standing up, others (as in the case of sleepiness and other indications) quite as plainly show that the people were sitting or reclining. So that there was no uniformity in this matter, it probably varied with time, place and circumstances. The audiences were more free and easy than now, more like a popular assembly. They often expressed approval or disapproval. Even so mighty a man as Bernard alludes in one of his sermons—perhaps more—to this, saying in effect, “I see by the way you shake your heads and whisper that what I am saying does not please you ; but it is true,” and so on. The preacher was often confidential and conversational with his audience, introducing dialogue, homely illustration, humor, and sometimes even undignified, not to say irreverent drollery. The fresh popular preaching of the twelfth century had not yet got on stilts. Of course there were differences between individuals in this as in other regards. The mode of delivery of sermons was usually that of free speech after more or less of preparation ; sometimes the homilies were learned by heart and recited ; and there are some indications that sermons were occasionally read from manuscript—possibly not always the preacher’s own !¹

Before concluding our survey of the preaching of the twelfth century it may be well to give a specimen in illustration of some of the points hitherto presented. It is taken from Morris’ *Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century*² as translated by him from the Saxon, the subject being the Nativity of Our Lord, and runs thus: “*Natus est nobis hodie Salvator qui est Christus in civitate David.*”³ Good tidings and pleasant to hear the lord St. Luke tells us in the holy gospel, and saith that an holy messenger brought them from heaven to the land of Jerusalem, and told them to the shepherds who were

¹ Lecoy de la Marche, Pars II., chap. V.

² P. 30.

³ It was usual in the vernacular sermons to retain the Latin in announcing the text, in quoting Scripture and other sayings, though nearly always the Latin was either translated or paraphrased.

watching over their cattle beside the city of Bethlehem. Listen now and attend how he told the tidings word by word. . . .” The author goes on to explain how great the joy was, and proceeds: “These words the angel said because that man should fill up the angels’ seat (which had been forfeited when Lucifer and his company fell out thereof), and not on account of angels’ sickness, who have eternal health; but for man’s sickness, who are all sick, and have all been so since affliction came upon our first father Adam, as our Lord saith in the holy gospel: *Homo quidam descendebat ab Jerusalem in Jericho et incidit in latrones, etc.* Our Lord Jesus Christ saith that a man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and came upon thieves, and they spoiled him of all his rich garments and wounded him very sorely, and left him scarcely alive. This is said of Adam, *Qui descendit a beatitudine caeli in defectus hujus mundi*.¹ It was Adam that went out from the perfect bliss of paradise into the wretched state of this world, and led after him then nigh all his offspring.” The preacher proceeds to explain that the thieves were the devils who robbed man of the three garments of grace, immortality and innocence, and inflicted on him wounds, that is manifold sins. So God punished him for these sins, and sent many sorrows upon all. Then he goes on: “And in such sickness they longed eagerly for our Saviour; and he came, thanked be he, to heal them of their sin wounds and to clothe them in those honorable garments which the devil had taken from our forefather Adam.” He sent messengers to announce his coming—patriarchs, prophets, angels, and now this angel. Not to the great of earth, but to these shepherds.—“Therefore I will tell you (take heed thereto and understand it) what the herdsmen, and what the nightwatches, and what the cattle betoken; and first of all what the wild beast denotes.”—Quotes Peter’s saying about our adversary the devil, comments on it, and proceeds.—“The flocks which this beast worrieth are sheep, and oxen, and goats, and swine.”—Shows how men fall into each of these classes, and goes on.—“Some men lead a pure life and neither do nor say anything unpleasant to their fellowmen, but love God and go each day to church as sheep to the

¹ Probably the words of the Latin homily or of a church writer.

fold, and do gladly their duty to the church and give alms to poor men, and are called sheepish men.”—The oxen likewise signify the good “who will do nothing wrong, but labor with the earth and till much for other men’s behoof, and these are called oxish [or neatish] men. Of these sheepish and oxish men speaketh the prophet thus, *Subjecisti sub pedibus ejus oves et boves*, that is to say the sheepish and the neatish men are in bondage to Christ.”¹ The goatish men, our preacher at some length explains, are the lascivious who live in their evil ways, reek of their sins, and will be punished in hell. The swinish men are those who “pass their lives in eating and drinking as swine, which foul themselves and root up and sniff ever foully and much enjoy foul things, and when they are full they go to the foul mire and therein wallow ———, and therefore they are called swinish men. And in them the devil dwelleth by the leave of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the holy gospel saith.”—Quotes the passage in Latin and goes on, “Our Lord drove many devils together out of a man who was out of his wits, and thus healed him, and the devils entreated our Lord Jesus Christ to send them into a flock of swine, and he did so; and the swine ran, as the devils drove them, into the sea and drowned themselves. So giveth our Lord leave to the devil to be in the swinish men of whom I have before spoken, and to dwell in them and to drown them and to bring them out of their wits and to drive them from one wrong to another, from a little vice to a great one, from sin to sin, from evil to evil, and lastly he drowneth them in shameful death and leadeth them with him to hell.”

The shepherds, of course, represent “the teachers of holy church which pasture their flocks on sweet pastures which are the good words of Holy Book.” The preacher describes and condemns the bad shepherds, and then speaks of the good. These keep watch during the night, that is this life.—“And this life in which we live is compared to night because it is so dark through our horrible sins. In this night there are four night-watches: before evening, which belongeth to children; midnight, which belongeth to youth; cockcrow, which belongeth to grown

¹ Literally, “are in thrallship to Christ.”

men; morning-time to old men. These herdsmen that are teachers, as bishops and priests, watch before evening; then are the children well brought up. At midnight he watcheth, when he taketh away the vices of youth and teacheth them the good. At cockcrow he watcheth, when he turneth the full-grown men to God's service. In the morning he watcheth, when he turneth old men to the bliss of our Lord Jesus Christ."—Then with an application to his hearers, and a reference to baptism and the Lord's Supper the homily concludes.

3. PREACHERS OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY

The number of preachers in the twelfth century seems to have been relatively greater than ever before. Besides all the orders of clergy there were many unauthorized preachers—especially among the so-called heretics. All these men of course differed widely among themselves in character, all the way from the earnest and sincere down to the false and vicious; in talents and culture, from the few of exceptional ability down to the mediocre and the strangely ignorant; in modes of thought and life, from the great prelate busy with worldly affairs to the ascetic hermit who had fled the world; from the absorbed scholar to the rough and ready popular preacher. Classification of so varied a body of men is difficult, no matter what basis we take. The grouping adopted for the last period will still be found serviceable—parochial, cloistral, and missionary or popular. In the thirteenth century we shall find it possible to classify the preachers with some degree of accuracy according to their mode of thinking and working, into scholastic, popular, and mystic; and tokens of this distinction are already at hand in the twelfth century. Thus, for example, Peter Lombard is scholastic, Fulco of Neuilly is popular, and Hugo of St. Victor is mystic; while Bernard of Clairvaux combined in himself the mystic and popular elements, with traces of the scholastic. If we group the preachers simply by nationality our difficulties are not removed; for in many cases it is hard to say to what nation a man properly belongs. Often he was born in one country, was educated in another, worked and died in a third. As for languages all the educated knew and used Latin, and several of them spoke

more than one of the dialects. Yet, without being very exact, we may consider them according to countries; and since we find that of the four leading countries of Europe France was very far in advance in the number and quality of her preachers, we shall briefly discuss the others first, reserving the French preachers for more extended notice.

In Italy, as in the other European countries, the number of preachers in this period was large, and many sermons have come down to us in the Latin language.¹ There was also no doubt preaching in Italian, as both Marengo and Zanotto, independently of each other, show.² The latter scholar³ describes the period as one "in which the new art [i.e., new mode of preaching] grew up, rough and without monuments of high value, developing itself under the dominion of the scholastic method and the Latin language." There are few Italian preachers of this age whom it would be profitable to study; but there are three who for different reasons stand apart from the commonplace crowd, and though few, if any, homiletical remains are preserved from them, they yet influenced the course of thought and of preaching in such ways as to claim some notice here.

Near the end of the eleventh century, in a little town of Lombardy, was born, of what parentage is unknown, a boy who was named Peter,⁴ and later called from his native region, the "Lombard." His talents gained the notice of a benefactor who provided for his education at Bologna. Thence he went to France, with a letter of recommendation to the great Bernard, who aided him in attending school first at Rheims, and then at Paris in the famous abbey of St. Victor. His progress was great, and he was made bishop of Paris in 1159, but resigned the next year. He was the greatest teacher and representative of the Scholastic philosophy in his time. His famous treatise, "Sentences," exercised a profound influence on his own and subsequent times. Bourgain briefly criticises him as "celebrated theologian, mediocre

¹ See Marengo, *op. cit.*, cap. I.; and F. Zanotto, *Storia della Predicazione nei Secoli della Letteratura Italiana*, cap. I.

² Ibb.

³ P. 7.

⁴ Works in Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tt. 191, 192; and notices of his life in various authorities, especially Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchenlexicon*, Bd. 9, S. 1916 ff.

preacher." But his influence on thought and on preaching entitles him at least to this short notice.

Also from northern Italy and contemporary with Peter, was Arnold of Brescia (d. 1155).¹ He, too, as a young man, was attracted to Paris by the fame of its teachers; and there he became an admirer and friend of Abelard, who influenced him profoundly. Returning to Brescia, and being now a priest and preacher, he attacked the corruptions of the church, and maintained that it should free itself from political and other worldly entanglements. Banished from home he spent some years in France, Switzerland and Bohemia. Later he was allowed to be at Rome, but attracting followers, and encouraging a revolt with the idea of establishing a republic, he was taken and executed in 1155. No sermons remain, but his powerful eloquence is admitted by foes and admired by friends; and its monument is in its effects and in the fact that even to this day in Italy his name is dear to lovers of liberty. Apart from his political influence his preaching against Romish evils was moving and powerful.

A very notable man in his day, and still more in his subsequent influence, was Joachim (Gioacchino) (d. 1202), abbot of Floris in Calabria.² He was born in Sicily not earlier than 1130. After a pilgrimage to the Holy Land he became head of a monastery of the Cistercian order in Italy, and later was permitted to establish a new abbey at Floris (Fiore), regulated by very strict principles and earnestly devoted to flight from the world and to study. He enjoyed the favor of the emperor Henry VI., and of the empress Constance, and was during his life to all appearance on good terms with the popes, though later some of his writings were condemned. He was a man of great personal influence and probably of eloquence. He does not seem to have preached or taught

¹ The church histories and encyclopedias usually give good accounts of Arnold. The German historian, Giesebrecht, has in modern times given him great fame, and there is a long account of his controversy with Bernard in Neander's *Heilige Bernhard*, S. 222 ff.

² Besides the church histories, etc., Sabatier's *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*, p. 46 ff (Am. ed.); and a critical article by E. Schott in Brieger und Bess, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Jahrgang 1901, S. 343 ff.

much outside of his cloister, but through his monks and his writings he came to have decisive influence upon the course of thought and of preaching. His significance (dimly foreshadowing Savonarola three centuries later) was that of prophet and reformer. Schott¹ thinks that his prophetic scheme was tampered with by his pupils, and we cannot be sure that all which purports to be his is authentic. "The Everlasting Gospel" is the phrase chosen to designate his scheme, which divides history into three great eras corresponding to the Persons of the Trinity and to the three greatest apostles: That of the Father, represented by Peter, the introduction of Christianity; that of the Son, represented by Paul, the early history of Christianity; and that of the Spirit, represented by John, the contemporary age, toward the end of the world. While he believed in the Catholic Church he attacked sharply its corruptions. He mightily stirred the better spirits of his age and place, and the effects of his work were among the influences which shaped the purposes and character of the young Francis of Assisi.²

Germany, too, was not without its representatives. We have seen that the collections of homilies among the Germans, whether in Latin or the vernacular, are almost entirely anonymous. Yet in some cases the name of the author, or compiler rather, is given; and of these three—two in Latin and one in German—deserve notice.

One of these goes under the name of Honorius Scholasticus (d. c. 1150), sometimes also called Augustodunensis. It is not perfectly clear that Honorius was a German, as he lived long in France, but the probabilities are that he was.³ His life is wrapped in obscurity. But he seems to have been born in Germany near the beginning of the twelfth century and to have lived and taught long in an abbey at Autun (Augustodunum) in France, whence he returned to another cloister in his native land, and died near the middle of the century. He was a very prolific writer on a number of theological subjects,⁴ and his writings were highly prized especially in south Germany.⁵ It is, however, as a preacher and compiler of sermons that he concerns us.

¹ *Op. cit.*

² Sabatier, *ad loc.*

³ Linsenmayer, S. 194, and note; Cruel, S. 129 ff.

⁴ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 172.

⁵ Linsenmayer, *ad loc.*

His collection¹ is called *Speculum Ecclesiæ*, "Mirror of the Church;" and the story of its origin and purposes is given in the preface. According to this the brethren of his order addressed to him an urgent request to publish for the benefit of a larger circle the discourses which he had, so greatly to their profit, delivered in the convent. Honorius replies that "the most skillful painters, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, and very many others, had beautifully decorated the house with a wonderful, heavenly and varied painting;" but as they were perhaps in some measure beyond comprehension, or extracts from them had become through frequent use somewhat trite, he would respond to the request of his brethren and put forth this little "tablet" which he had painted, unworthy indeed to be compared with the great works of the masters, but nevertheless new and likely to be of some help to those who should use it. He calls it the "Mirror of the Church," which "all priests may hang up before the eyes of the church, that the Bride of Christ by it may see what in her still is displeasing to her Bridegroom, and may conform her ways and acts to his image." Then he gives a set of instructions for conducting worship, and says, "Having then by the grace of the Holy Spirit received inwardly the word of God in his name thus humbly begin:" Then follows the first sermon, on the Nativity of our Lord. Near the end, having made a good stopping place, he gives this hint to the preacher: "Here make an end if you wish; but if time permits add the following"—and gives some more. Instructions like this abound throughout the sermons. In one he says that if it is very cold, or very hot, "or any other impediment hinders," the preacher may omit certain parts, otherwise he may add so and so. In another he says, "In all the sermons you ought first to pronounce the verse in the Latin tongue, and then explain in the common tongue (*patria lingua*)."

As to the merits of the sermons themselves the general criticism on all similar collections is applicable—except that these have a certain freshness in the compilation and show a trace of originality here and there in handling the materials. There is a good deal of striving after effect, particularly in the use of the

¹ Migne, *op. cit.*, col. 813 ss.

rhymed prose, or assonance, then so popular. It is probable that this was done in some measure to aid the memory of the preacher as well as for rhetorical effect. The *Speculum* was much used, and became a mine from which other compilers and translators liberally helped themselves.

Early in the century, but after Honorius, a certain Werner (d. 1126), of Ellerbach,¹ abbot of St. Blasius in the Black Forest, published a collection of sermons which he called *Deflorationes Patrum*, which, being interpreted, signifies "Flowers Plucked from the Fathers." Not only from many others but very freely from the *Speculum* of Honorius does our worthy Werner gather his flowers without being at all concerned to tell where he had been on his plucking expeditions. Thus in his introduction he states that his purpose was to offer a new collection of discourses for the use of preachers, as the old ones had become somewhat stale, and the people (the poor dear people!) needed a fresh supply. And even this idea was borrowed from Honorius! Of course it goes without saying that the "Gathered Flowers" are somewhat faded and dried up. But, as Cruel remarks, these sermons, as well as those of the "Mirror" were for several reasons above the reach of the less instructed clergy, particularly as they had to be turned into the vernacular when given to the people; and so there was evident need of some collections in the native tongue and of simpler style. This want was met by the production of those numerous collections in German which have already been mentioned. These were partly done directly from the older sources and partly were translations and adaptations from the Latin collections.² It is worth while to notice here only that one which bears the name of its author, Conrad the Priest.

In the last decades of the twelfth century a certain priest named Conrad³ lived and worked in the neighborhood of Lake Constance. He published a collection of sermons in the old German dialect, with a Latin introduction in which he states the purpose of the book. He—like the widow with her mites—offers his little con-

¹ Cruel, S. 144 ff.

² Linsenmayer, S. 246.

³ Linsenmayer, SS. 247, 285 ff.; Albert Bd. II., S. 9, *et passim*.

tribution for the service of the priests of the Lord, "who love Christ, who preach Christ and not themselves, especially the plebeian and popular priests and those to whom perchance abundance of books is wanting, and who more often with blessed Martha have been anxious and occupied with external things, and on this account have the more rarely been able to sit with blessed Mary at the Lord's feet, that is, to give attention to sacred reading." The work contains a full set of sermons for the church year and a number for saints' days, all in the approved style. In all there are a hundred and fifty-four of these sermons, not very different from others in most respects, but easier in style and showing the author's gift of adapting his speech to the common people.

Passing by France for the present and coming over to the England¹ of the twelfth century we find there a state of things in regard to preaching quite like that which prevailed in Germany—a number of collections of homilies in the vernacular, but few preachers of note. We have seen² that as far back as the tenth or early eleventh century Aelfric had translated homilies into the Saxon English of the time. There were also other collections³ earlier than the twelfth century; and when we reach this date the collections become abundant. Unhappily the homilies are both dateless and nameless, but they are shown to belong to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Of these Morris says:⁴ "None of them seem to be copied—from Aelfric's treatises. Most of them perhaps were originally translated from Latin homilies, though some few have the appearance of original compositions. Omitting a few allusions to the gluttony and drunkenness of the period, and to the profligacy of the clergy, and the rapacity of the rich, there is nothing that throws any light upon the social condition of the twelfth century."⁵ The religious instruction given in

¹ See Morris, *Old English Homilies*; and Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages in England*, especially chaps. VI. and XIV.

² Above, p. 170.

³ Cutts, p. 223; Morris, Vol. I., Preface, p. xi, and Vol. II., Introduction, p. VII.

⁴ Vol. II. (Twelfth century), Int. pp. ix, x.

⁵ In this respect they are quite different from the French collections, as Bourgain and Lecoy de la Marche have shown.

these homilies is of a very simple character; and all the discourses, while not without interest, possess much quaintness in the mode in which the Scriptures were popularly expounded." In general tone, doctrine, and method the English homilies are very like those in use elsewhere in Europe. As Cutts has pointed out¹ the Norman conquerors did not disturb the parish priests, and yet the Conquest opened the way to a larger influence from the Continent.

Among the English preachers of the century was a certain Ailred (or Ethelred), of Revesby (c. 1109-1166).² He was born of good family, near Durham, about 1109, and as a child was most promising in mind and character. He "spent his youth in the court of David, King of Scotland, as one of the attendants of his son Henry, and while there gave a remarkable instance of his sweetness of character by forgiving one of his enemies who had slandered him. David was much attached to him, and would have made him a bishop; but he preferred to become a monk, and entered the Cistercian abbey of Rievaulx in the North Riding of Yorkshire."³ Later he was abbot of Revesby, and afterwards of Rievaulx. He was highly esteemed by King Henry II., and by his contemporaries generally. He did some successful missionary work among the rude Picts of Scotland, was a historical writer of some importance, and took active interest in the affairs of his time. He suffered from ill health toward the close of his life, but bore his sufferings meekly, and kept at his work to the end. Altogether he appears to have been an amiable, earnest, active man. He died and was buried at Rievaulx in 1166.

He left numerous historical and theological writings, among which are a number of sermons.⁴ They are not remarkable, being in the fashion of the age—such as has been sufficiently pointed out. He was so taken with the allegorical method of interpretation and so fertile in finding the spiritual meanings of Scripture that he could spin out a number of them from one word as a text.⁵

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 84 ff.

² Rothe, *Gesch. der Pred.*, S. 218 f; *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. XVIII, p. 33 f; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 195.

³ *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, *ad loc.*

⁴ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 195; Rothe, S. 219.

⁵ Rothe, *ad. loc.*

A very different man from Ailred was Peter of Blois (d. c. 1200), who was a Frenchman, but claims notice among the English preachers of the time, for reasons that will appear. Born at or near Blois, he was educated at Tours, at Bologna (where he studied law), and at Paris. He lived several years in Sicily, where he was tutor to a royal prince. He did not like Sicily, and though offered ecclesiastical honors there, returned to France, where he taught for a while and held various church appointments. Some time during this period he entered the service of the English king, Henry II., and under his patronage came later to England, where he filled different posts in the church. He was never appointed to high office, and seems to have been a self-seeking, quarrelsome sort of man, with a plenty of self-conceit, but possessed of learning and talents that made him useful. His letters, full of vanity as they are, have some value among historical sources for the period; and his other writings show considerable ability, but not of a very high order. His sermons receive commendation from Bourgain,¹ but Rothe² says that the six short sermons remaining from him offer nothing of interest, except that they were delivered in Saxon English and were afterwards written out in Latin by the author himself, who confesses that they were "quite crudely and insipidly written." Thus they hardly represent the sermons as delivered, and it is worth noting that this Anglicized Frenchman preached in the English of his time. The sermons, as we have them, are lacking in good arrangement, and are full of digressions. Altogether the English pulpit has but a mediocre rank in the twelfth century.

As in other respects, so in preaching, the leading place among the European peoples of the twelfth century was held by France. We are greatly indebted to the labors of Lecoy de la Marche and Bourgain for a vivid portraiture of the preaching of the period. These scholars have not confined themselves to the printed sources, but have given the world the benefit of their studies of many old French manuscripts of that age.

It will be convenient to consider in one group the three

¹ P. 63.

² S. 219.

most important preachers of the first crusade. Pope Urban II. (d. 1099) was a Frenchman, Odo by name, and was born of knightly family in Chatillon sur Marne, probably early in the eleventh century. While still young he became a monk at Clugny, where he soon adopted the strenuous ideas of Gregory VII. as to the papacy. His worth and talents attracted attention and he was rapidly promoted. In 1078 he was made a cardinal by Gregory VII., and on the death of Gregory's immediate successor Odo was made pope, taking the name of Urban II., in March, 1088. In 1095, it will be remembered, he assembled a council at Clermont, on the soil of his native France, to consider the undertaking of the first crusade. Here a great assembly of prelates and nobles was gathered, and Urban addressed them several times upon the theme that lay upon his heart. One day, in the open air (for no building could accommodate the throng), he poured forth his soul in one of the most effective addresses of history. There is, of course, no exact reproduction of this famous speech. Several reports of it were made¹ and have been preserved. These are quite unlike in form, but much the same in contents. The substance of the report of it by William of Malmesbury² is this: Christian people should be ashamed to let unbelievers possess two-thirds of the whole world, including the Holy Land, which they were desolating. He promised full absolution to all who would undertake a holy war to deliver the sacred places from their grasp. If those who went died in the attempt they would be sure of heaven, if they succeeded they would see the sepulchre of the Lord. Why should they fear to die? Let them go forth as soldiers of the cross! The speech awakened wild enthusiasm; men waved their swords and shouted, "God wills it!" Thus the crusades were begun—under the spell of a timely and powerful eloquence. Of Urban's sermons, properly speaking, there are no remains;³ but he was an active preacher and the tradition of his eloquence is well sustained.

¹ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 151.

² *Op. cit.*, col. 571 ss.

³ Migne, *op. cit.*, col. 563 ss, gives an address at the dedication of a church, and another at the ordination of Ivo as bishop of Chartres.

Peter the Hermit (d. 1115),¹ according to the more recent opinions, was probably sent out by Urban II. soon after the Council of Clermont to arouse the people in behalf of the crusade. It is now doubted whether he was in Palestine at all before he went with the crusaders. But it appears that he claimed to have been there and to have seen a vision; or this may have been a later invention to embellish the stories of his eloquence. According to the usual accounts Peter was born at or near Amiens early in the eleventh century. The surname, the Hermit, was given him by his contemporaries and indicates that he lived in retirement. But Guibert of Nogent's description of his eloquence² leads us to infer that he was a popular and useful preacher—coming from his retirement to preach to the people—before he began the crusade preaching. Guibert says that he never knew a man to be held in such high esteem, that he composed quarrels, made peace, rescued fallen women, was loaded with presents, and regarded as a saint whose word was an oracle. When he took up the crusade preaching his work had a tremendous effect. He stirred the people of all classes, gathered multitudes to his own standard, and without waiting for the princes and military leaders led the hapless crowd. He was unfitted for leadership and could not control his followers. But that part of his story does not belong here. He preached and performed priestly duties for the crusaders, but returned to France (probably after the capture of Jerusalem) and became monk and prior of an abbey at Huy, where he died in 1115.

Along with Urban and Peter should be named Raoul the Ardent (Radulphus Ardens, d. 1101),³ who was born (date uncertain) near Poitiers, and was known as a parish priest in that region. It appears that he went with one of the expeditions of the first crusade, under William of Poitiers and Aquitaine, and that he died in Palestine about 1101. This is about all that has come down to us concerning his life; but in his case we have a group of more than thirty sermons remaining. They

¹ See Broadus, *Hist. Pre.*, p. 95 f, for a brief notice of Peter's popular eloquence, and for critical accounts see the articles in Herzog and in Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchenlexicon* (Catholic).

² Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 156, col. 704-5.

³ Bourgain, p. 55; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 155.

show that he deserved his surname of Ardent; for they are earnest, with a note of conviction and of concern for the spiritual welfare of his hearers. In denouncing sin he spares none—whether princes, clergy, or people—and yet he mingles with his warnings a tenderness and charity which show forth a true soul. In style he is often rough and in bad taste, but vigor is not wanting; and he exhibits an originality in refreshing contrast to most of the sermons of the age. He espoused the crusade with all his ardor, and like Peter practised what he preached by going himself.

A notable prelate in the early twelfth century was Ivo, bishop of Chartres (d. 1116). He was a man of distinction and influence in his day, and was quite diligent as a preacher. Twenty-four short sermons remain from him.¹ They were highly esteemed, and one of them is preserved even to this day in the Roman Breviary. Bourgain says of him, "Without being eloquent he joined to knowledge a vivid imagination; his method is neat; he does not embarrass with an enumeration of texts, eschews subtle divisions, slowness and lifeless dialect."

Another famous prelate of the early part of the century was Hildebert (d. 1134), at first bishop of Mars, and later archbishop of Tours. He was the contemporary and the equal of great men; but does not seem to have been especially great as a preacher if we judge by his few remaining sermons;² but the man enjoyed a better reputation than these sermons indicate; and yet in them are some traces of real worth, as the critic already quoted says that they are "dignified, elevated, paternal, tempered by the sweet authority of the pontiff."

Here we must mention the celebrated theologian, Peter Abelard (d. 1142). For Abelard, too, is among the prophets, though by a slender title. Famous as the unhappy lover of Eloise he has awakened in all times the interest of the romantic; favored with the heresy-hating hostility of Bernard he has claimed the sympathy of the liberal minded; brilliant as a lecturer, he had the admiration of hundreds of students, and his fame endures; acute as a thinker, he has a secure place among the scholastic.

¹ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 162, and Bourgain, pp. 32, 276, 296.

² *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 171; Bourgain, p. 37 et suiv.

theologians of his era; but all in all the man does not rank among the highest, by virtue either of character or work. As a preacher he is remembered by thirty-four sermons,¹ preached probably after he retired to the cloister, and, it seems, written out at the request of Eloise. They are not great as sermons, but only claim mention because of the author's fame in other directions.

By all odds the most prominent figure among the French preachers of the twelfth century is that of the famous Cistercian monk, theologian, mystic, man of affairs, partisan, crusade evangelist, and popular preacher, Bernard (1091-1153), abbot of Clairvaux, and saint not only by canon but by general consent.² Bernard was born at Fontaines near Dijon, third son of the brave knight Tecelin and Aleth, a pious lady of excellent family. Though she died while Bernard was yet a boy her influence over him was holy and permanent, and so she takes a worthy place among those noble mothers to whom in all the Christian ages some distinguished preachers have owed the best that was in them. The lad was of weakly frame and unfit for military duty, so he was early destined for the church and educated with that in view. For a short time during his school days he seems to have tasted a bit of the worldly life about him; but the memories of his mother, and the influence of a lonely and thoughtful journey speedily recalled him to higher things, and with characteristic firmness and devotion he turned his back upon the world. It is quite like him that he induced a goodly number of others to join him in this renunciation, his lifelong trait of personal influence thus early exhibiting itself. After leading a retired life for a while he and his companions entered the famous monastery of Citeaux, which had given name to the Cistercian order of monks. The abbey was just then

¹ *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 178, col. 379 ss.

² Sources and authorities for Bernard are of course numerous. His works and letters are given in Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tt. 182-185, with much valuable editorial matter by Mabillon and others. He receives ample treatment at the hands of Bourgain, and notice from all the other historians and critics of the preaching of the period. The great monograph of Neander is still valuable, and the late Dr. R. S. Storrs has done American readers and literature a noble service in his *Bernard of Clairvaux*.

not very flourishing, but the entrance of this fine body of about thirty young men under the lead of such a spirit as Bernard gave it new life. Soon its growth was so rapid as to require division and colonization. One of these colonies was established at Clairvaux (*clara vallis*, vale of light), and Bernard was chosen to be its abbot. This was his heart's home through all his busy life, and with it his name is forever associated. He had later in his career frequent invitations to other places and higher preferment, but he put them all aside and remained simply abbot of Clairvaux.

He practised a rigid asceticism, disciplined his monks with a strict but loving care, taught them and preached to them with all fidelity, received with sweet cordiality the visitors who sought him for help and counsel in the spiritual life, and was in all essentials according to the demands of the age a model monk and abbot.

But a man of his powers could not be hid in a monastery. Soon his wonderful preaching began to attract crowds to Clairvaux, and his capacity for affairs marked him as fitted for severer tasks than the peaceful direction of a cloister. He soon became the most notable man in the church in France, and from thence his influence and activities spread through Italy and Germany. He was especially successful in healing disputes, and was the able defender of Catholic orthodoxy alike against the scholastic subtleties of Abelard and the popular evangelical views of Peter of Bruys and Henry of Lausanne. He favored and helped to shape the foundation of the order of Knights of the Temple. Though refusing to be the head of his own order, he was the most active man in promoting its rapid and wide spread.

On the death of Pope Honorius II. in 1130 the cardinals were divided and chose different men for the papacy. Innocent II., the choice of the minority, had the weaker title, but he was the fitter man. Fearing his rival's stronger party he fled to France and sought protection from King Louis VI. The monarch referred the matter to the bishops of the realm, and they held an assembly to decide which pope they should recognize. Bernard, though not a bishop, was called in and asked to present his views, and he took so decided ground in

favor of Innocent and urged his cause with such eloquent y persuasiveness that the assembly unanimously decided to recognize Innocent as pope. Bernard visited some of the principal cities of Italy in the interest of his man, and by 1138 his efforts were so successful that he saw Innocent generally recognized and the schism healed. Now he turned back to his beloved Clairvaux to rest and teach his monks. But new labors and burdens were in store for him. Soon came his strife with the acute and x philosophic Abelard, whose clever lectures were unsettling the orthodox faith, and none could be found to answer the heretic and force him to retract so well as Bernard. Then came the troubles at Rome about Arnold of Brescia, and Bernard bore an active part on the papal side in this controversy. To Bernard too fell the duty of opposing the work of the evangelical heretics, Peter and Henry, in the south of France. He preached among the people there with great acceptance, but the work of those men was too well done to be overcome even by the eloquence of a Bernard. Finally, in 1146, he was charged by the y pope with the duty of preaching the second crusade, and he went through France, Italy and Germany on this mission.

In Germany, though he had to preach by an interpreter, the people were moved to tears and enthusiasm by his voice and manner, while he spoke himself, before the interpreter could translate his words. Thousands were induced to take the cross. He did not accompany the crusaders—perhaps because he was physically unfit to contend with the hardships of the camp, perhaps because the authorities needed him at home—and the failures and y disasters which befell the enterprise bore heavily upon his spirits. Yet he went on preaching and teaching all he could at Clairvaux, but being often called upon for those outer tasks from which he shrank, though so well performing them, and ever coming back to refresh his soul among his brother monks in studying and expounding the word of God. At last, worn out with toil, he died and was buried at Clairvaux, August 20, 1153.

It is hard to put into a few words a fair estimate of this great and many-sided man. The faculties of his singularly rich nature were held in admirable poise. The

strong and vigorous intellect and the abounding energy of purpose and act were a wholesome offset to the soft and spiritual mellowness of his piety, while this last, like the gentle warmth of an autumn day, suffused the other two, keeping thought from barren and cold speculation, and restraining splendid leadership from ambition and arrogance. The English writer, Vaughan, in his *Hours with the Mystics*,¹ has admirably put the matter thus: "Against the self-indulgence which would sacrifice every active external obligation to a life of contemplative sloth, he protested all his days by word and example. He knew the world and men; he stood with his fellows in the breach, and the shock of conflict spoiled him for a dreamer. The distractions over which he expended so much complaint were his best friends. They made him the worse monk, and by so much the better man." He has been compared by many to Augustine; and Bourgain² draws a fine parallel between Bernard and Pascal. He was not equal to either of these in depth of intellect, but the mystical trace was common to all, and the neat and terse way of expressing bright and soulful things. }

Bernard was an excellent preacher. He is one of the comparatively few whose published sermons sustain traditional reputation. The stories of his eloquence and its wonderful power over all sorts and conditions of men do not strike us as overstrained when we read, with all just allowances, the discourses which remain from him. Doubtless many other critics would agree with Broadus³ in saying, "I think that beyond any other mediæval preacher, he will repay the student of the present day." A large number of his discourses are preserved to us.⁴ The first given in Migne's edition are seven on the Advent, and these are perhaps most often read. They are characteristic; clear in thought and language, sweet and pious in spirit; full of the current Catholic adoration of the Virgin, but not to the obscuration of the Lord whom he praises and loves. They have many a well-turned and happy phrase, which seems to come with perfect ease and naturalness without the least straining. While not severely analytical the sermons usually have clearly

¹ P. 143.² *Hist. Prea.*, p. 100.³ Pp. 92 et suiv.⁴ *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 183.

marked divisions. In the first sermon he thus indicates his plan: "Do you therefore, brethren, to whom as unto babes God reveals things that are hidden from the wise and prudent—consider with sedulous thought, and diligently weigh the reason of this Advent, seeking, namely, who it is that comes, whence, whither, for what purpose, and in what way." He discusses these points in the order indicated, but when he comes to the last, "in what way," he postpones that for next time as being "worthy of a special sermon, especially since to-day's sermon has gone on at length." Following the sermons on the Advent are a number on the holy seasons (*de temporibus*), and then a course of 125 on various subjects (*de diversis*), and the collection concludes with eighty-six on the Song of Solomon. These, according to the editor in Migne's collection, were begun in 1135 and were cut short by the author's lamented death in 1153. He was thus eighteen years (of course at intervals) working at the series, and it reaches only to the first verse of the third chapter. The first sermon treats of the title—why Song of All Songs?—because it is an allegory of the love between Christ and his Bride, the Church. Then come seven different sermons on the first verse, "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth." The minute allegorical treatment of every phase of meaning suggested to the pious mystic by these words is curious, but a trifle tedious. Of course the interpretation is not now generally accepted, and the long drawn series is somewhat wearisome; but as specimens of preaching these discourses have the merits of brevity, clearness, adaptation, and a devout and gracious spirit. To feel their full force we must imagine ourselves among that rapt group of monks at Clairvaux listening while the revered master opens his heart in these loving sermons that breathe out his yearnings for communion with his Lord. We shall then warm toward the preacher and appreciate both his devout feeling and his perfect taste as he says in his opening paragraph:¹

¹ *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 183, col. 787. The exquisite original defies translation and is as follows: "Revera pauper et inops pulso ad eum qui aperit et nemo claudit super sermonis hujus profundissimo sacramento. Oculi omnium in te sperant, Domine. Parvuli petierunt panem; non est qui frangat eis; speratur id a benignitate tua. O piissime, frange esurientibus panem tuum, meis quidem, si dignaris, manibus, sed tuis viribus."

“Truly poor and needy I knock unto him who openeth and no man shutteth, in regard to the most profound subject of this discourse. The eyes of all look in hope to thee, O Lord. These little ones have asked for bread; there is none to break it to them; that is hoped for from thy dear grace. Break thou thy bread, O kindest One, to those who hunger, by my hands it may be, if so thou deignest, but by thy power.”

Resembling Bernard in some respects was Norbert,¹ founder of the Augustinian order of Præmonstrants (d. 1154). Though reckoned with propriety among the French preachers he was born on German soil in Cleves, of good family. After brilliant studies he became a cleric. But he lived easily, sometimes at the court of the archbishop of Cologne, sometimes at that of the emperor Henry. He was loved and flattered by many because of his fortune, his social rank, his fine personal qualities. But from an easy-going and not spotless worldly life he was recalled. Out riding one day he was caught in a storm and stunned by a flash of lightning. On coming to himself he asked, “Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?” and seemed to hear a voice which said, “Forsake evil, do good, seek peace and pursue it.” He passed the next days in prayer, and soon begged to be ordained. On being invited by a dean to occupy his pulpit he consented. He enlarged on the vanity of life and lashed the faults of the worldly clergy. The discourse created a commotion. Next day he fell to it again with such effect that one of the priests, whose conscience was smitten, struck him in the face. All this advertised his preaching, and the crowds came. He had found his work. He met much opposition, but also some encouragement from the church authorities, and was very laborious and successful in his work as a travelling preacher. Norbert, like Bernard, was especially gifted and successful as a preacher of peace and reconciler of disputes. He was offered the church of St. Martin, diocese of Rheims, but the canons objected—he was too much of a reformer. Soon afterwards he founded at Prémontré a monastery and order of Augustinian monks, called from the place, Præmonstrants. They were devoted to preaching, and

¹ Bourgain, p. 128 et suiv.

Norbert was thus in some degree a precursor of Dominic and Francis in the next century. He was finally made archbishop of Magdeburg, in which office he died in 1154.

While at Magdeburg he put in order a collection of his sermons to the people, but, unfortunately, only a few fragments survive. But the tradition of his powerful and reformatory popular eloquence remains. He was undoubtedly one of the foremost preachers of the time.

Later, living to almost the end of the century (1196), was Maurice of Sully,¹ the famous bishop of Paris, and founder of the church of Nôtre Dame. He saw a bishopric afar off when yet a poor boy, and refused an alms which was offered to him on the condition that he should give up his ambition to be a bishop. His parents were poor, but somehow the boy managed to get an education, and made the best use of his opportunities. He entered an abbey and was rapidly promoted. He made an excellent parish priest, and was advanced to the office of archdeacon. On the death of Peter Lombard the bishopric of Paris became vacant, and there was some difficulty in finding a successor, though there was no lack of aspirants. There are two stories of how Maurice received the coveted appointment. One is that the electors could not agree—in the embarrassment of their riches—and left it to three of their number to nominate the man, Maurice being a member of the committee. These could not agree, and left it to Maurice; whereupon he named himself, being conscientiously and solemnly of the opinion that he would best perform the duties of the office! The other story is more creditable to him. It is that the electors being at sea asked advice of King Louis VII., and the monarch inquired who was the best pastor and preacher among them all. The answer was that Maurice was the best pastor and preacher, but Peter Comestor² was the most learned in the Scriptures. The king gave a wise answer: "Choose Maurice for bishop, and let Peter be a teacher of the monks." So he became bishop of Paris in 1160; and soon afterwards it fell to him to christen the

¹ *Biographie Universelle*, s. v.; Lecoy de la Marche, p. 42 et suiv.; Bourgain, p. 48 et suiv.

² The Eater; so called not for his gluttony, but for his greed of learning.

royal infant who was later celebrated as Philip Augustus. He is also famous as having begun the building of the great and historic cathedral of Nôtre Dame, of which the cornerstone was laid by Pope Alexander III. in 1165. The work was of course not finished in Maurice's time, but he carried it well on and got a great deal of money for the building.

There is a pretty story that while he was bishop of Paris his old mother paid him a visit clad in the simple garb of the poor; but that the attendants would not admit her, and the ladies took her away and dressed her up properly to be presented to the great man. But when she was brought to him he said, "I do not know this lady; my mother was never dressed like this, but only in the simple clothing of the poor; I should recognize her in that." Taking the hint the ladies removed the old woman and changed back her clothes, whereupon the bishop received her with all love and reverence as his mother; the rebuke not being meant for her, but for the attendants. Later in life Maurice retired to the abbey of St. Victor, where he died in 1196.

A number of his sermons remain in manuscript, some in Latin and some in the old French of the twelfth century. These last are highly prized by French scholars on linguistic and literary grounds. As they have not been published, we are dependent on the judgment of the critics who have read them for an estimate of their worth. Both Lecoy de la Marche and Bourgain speak highly of them, but Daunou, a literary critic in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, takes a less favorable view of their value. Maurice enjoyed, however, great reputation as a preacher, and wrote a book of instructions on the art of preaching.

Toward the end of the twelfth century there appeared in the neighborhood of Paris a priest of the parish of Neuilly, who attracted great attention by the pungency and power of his sermons. His name was Foulques, or, in its Latin form, Fulco.¹ He was of very humble extraction and uneducated. On his first appearance he was laughed at for his ignorance, but he remedied that defect

¹ Lecoy de la Marche, p. 75 et suiv.; and for his life the article in Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchenlexicon*.

by earnest study, and it was not long before he had the great as well as the lowly crowding to hear him preach. He was sometimes almost suffocated by the throngs of people, and men literally tore away pieces of his clothing for souvenirs. He rebuked the great and helped the fallen. He was especially successful in the reclamation of fallen women, for whom he built and maintained a home. The story goes that he once said plainly to Richard the Lion Heart of England that the king had three daughters hanging to his neck from whose embrace he must disentangle himself if he would be saved. Richard said it was a lie, he had no daughters; whereupon the priest named them for him—Superbia, Cupiditas and Luxuria.¹ Instead of punishing the bold preacher Richard replied with bitterness that he would bequeath Superbia to the Templars, Cupiditas to the Cistercians, and Luxuria to the prelates. In 1198 Foulques was selected by Innocent III. as one of the preachers of the fourth crusade. His success was wonderful, reviving the traditions of Peter and of Bernard. Thousands were led to take the cross, and Foulques himself was enrolled among them. But he did not live to see the perversion and failure of the crusade, having died in 1202. No sermons remain from him, but the traditions of his eloquence and success are well founded.

The abbey of St. Victor at Paris was founded by William of Champeaux in 1108, and became famous for a number of distinguished men who studied and taught in its walls. The teaching office, especially as exercised in preaching to the monks, was one of the specialties at St. Victor, and Bourgain² tells how the brethren magnified the office by magnifying its difficulty and burden as the turn of each one came to preach. Among the most celebrated of these preachers were Hugo³ (d. 1141) and Richard⁴ (d. 1173). Neither of them was French by birth, Hugo being most probably a Saxon, while Richard was a Scotchman. Both were mystics and Richard was the pupil and successor of Hugo in the priory.

¹ Pride, Greed, and Luxury.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 117, 118.

³ Life and works in Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 175, with editorial matter by the Abbé Hugonin.

⁴ *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 196, ed. Hugonin.

Hugo had been brought up in his Saxon home, very largely under the advice of an uncle, who was an ecclesiastic. He early became a monk, adopting the Augustinian rule. Troubles and civil war drove the uncle and nephew from home, and after passing some time in the Netherlands they sought and found refuge in the abbey of St. Victor in Paris. Here the talents and acquirements of Hugo were highly valued, and in course of time he was made prior. He spent the rest of his life in teaching and preaching in his abbey.

Hugo was one of the most notable of the mediæval mystics.¹ That trait had been in Bernard combined with active popular preaching, in Hugo and Richard it was allied with scholasticism. Hugo taught that in the mental attitude to divine things there are three stages: cogitation, meditation, contemplation. By cogitation he meant thinking, the application of the purely intellectual processes to religious truth; by meditation he understood reflection, or brooding over the truth; by contemplation he intended to set forth the highest effort of the soul, immediate or intuitive insight into truth. In this he distinguished a lower and a higher stage, and this latter was the summit of attainment.² In the way of sermons Hugo left, first of all, nineteen homilies on the book of Ecclesiastes, which receive some praise from Bourgain,³ but are criticised as diffuse and overloaded with digression and allegory. Besides these are other sermons, which have warmth of feeling and ease of expression, but with the faults just mentioned.

Richard of St. Victor, succeeding Hugo as prior, was a Scotchman of hard thinking and energetic character. He was zealous for reform and discipline, but he was at the same time more of a scholastic than Hugo. He was an adept in the hair-splitting subtleties of logical analysis, and also in the most finespun and exaggerated allegorical interpretation of Scripture. This naturally falls in with the spirit of mysticism, and it finds striking exemplification in both the Victorines. Richard subdivides Hugo's

¹ Mysticism and its place in the preaching of the Middle Ages will receive fuller notice further on. See p. 266 ff.

² See Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*, p. 157.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 118.

three stages of the acquisition of truth and life into two each, making thus six steps in the process of finding God. The last and highest is above (and seems to be beyond!) reason, and is reached not so much by thought as by penitence and tears, being a sort of religious ecstasy. Richard left a number of treatises among his works, which had doubtless been given to the monks first as sermons or lectures. They show considerable sprightliness of thought and expression, but with the mystical and scholastic exaggerations already noticed.

The contemporary writings give much attention to the so-called heretics, especially in the south of France. Among them were several leaders and preachers of distinction. Of these especially important were Tanchelm (d. 1123), Peter of Bruys (d. c. 1124), his disciple Henry of Lausanne (d. c. 1148), and Peter Waldo, who about 1170 was sending out his "poor men of Lyons" as colporters and preachers. Sermons from these men are not preserved, but even the testimony of their Catholic enemies and persecutors declares their eloquence, their power over the people, and their enduring success in establishing their opinions in the hearts of their followers. The failure of Bernard to overcome their work we have already noticed, the effort of Dominic to counteract it will be mentioned later. All these things, and many others, indicate that these so-called heretics were men of conviction, of earnestness, of rare persuasive gifts.

CHAPTER VII

THE CULMINATION OF MEDIAEVAL PREACHING IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

The thirteenth century is in many respects the focus of the whole period (1095-1361) which we are now studying. In this great century mediæval preaching reached its acme of power. And, as usual, this result was due in large degree to events and characteristics of the times, to which we must give brief notice.

I. EUROPE IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

The four great peoples of England, France, Germany and Italy were they whose political and other national

affairs give to the thirteenth century its chief historic significance.

In England the era is noted for constitutional history. In 1215 the barons at Runnymede wrested Magna Charta from the weak hands of John; and though that famous instrument was not a concession to popular rights in our modern sense of that phrase, it yet was a bar to kingly tyranny and to the concentration of power in the royal hands. Later, however, the people found a tribune in Simon de Montfort, by whose efforts there was called in 1265 a representative parliament in which there sat for the first time knights of the shires and burghers from some of the towns. Thirty years later (1295) decisive turn was given to all of England's future political history by the assembling of the "model parliament" of Edward I. This was a really representative body; England's constitution of "king, lords and commons" is fixed for generations to come; the people have at last won a place in directing the affairs of government.

In France affairs took quite a different turn, and the development toward a consolidated and strengthened monarchy went on. The reign of Philip Augustus extended nearly a quarter of a century into the new era, and under him, as we have seen,¹ the monarchical principle made substantial gains. Philip II., who began to reign in 1223, pursued his father's policy, but died young, leaving his son Louis IX. a minor. But the queen-mother, Blanche of Castile, was a woman of character and ability, and as regent she held the reins of government with a firm hand. The preceding kings made the monarchy strong, "Saint Louis" now made it beloved and respected, bequeathing it in 1270 to his son Philip III. (the Hardy), who in turn soon left it to his son Philip IV. (the Fair) in 1285. This acute, unscrupulous, but able monarch holds his own against papal assumptions, and in other ways brings a vigorous and powerful reign over into the fourteenth century. Throughout the thirteenth century, therefore, France is the strongest political power in Europe.

In Germany the tangle continued. The great emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, had died in 1189. His son, Henry

¹ *Ante*, p. 176.

VI., married Constance, the heiress of the Norman kingdom of Naples and Sicily, and from this marriage came the brilliant and unfortunate Frederick II. (1215-1250). His long, eventful and turbulent reign was signalized by the final effort to subjugate Italy, by the death struggle with the papacy, and at last by the fall of his house. The murder of his son Conradin, or Conrad IV., in 1254, ended the long and splendid struggle of the Hohenstaufen against the papacy, and for political supremacy in Italy. After that, for about twenty years, was the Great Interregnum, with its anarchy and confusion, till in 1273 the choice of the electors at last fell upon Rudolf of Hapsburg, the founder of the imperial Austrian line. Rudolf gave up the struggle for Italy, and devoted himself to building up the wasted empire in its proper German character, and with him a new era in German history begins.

In Italy during this fateful century all the discordant elements of her mediæval politics were in seething chaos. In the north the faintly republican constitutions of the Lombard cities were giving way to those family tyrannies which characterized Italian civic history for centuries. In Piedmont the House of Savoy was already laying the basis of its future power. In the northwest Genoa, republican in government, was mistress of the seas and of commerce on that side; while her great rival in the northeast, Venice, was queen of the Adriatic, and under her doges was at the pinnacle of her greatness and wealth. In central Italy fair Florence, with her quasi-democratic government, was a prey to fierce internal discords, and toward the end of this century distinguished herself by sending into exile her illustrious son Dante. Across the peninsula further south stretched the fatal Papal States, the divisive wedge, destined to be the last stronghold of Italy's political dismemberment. In the south Naples and Sicily, the heritage and snare of Frederick II., came after Conrad's death into the hands of Charles of Anjou, but the unpopular French sovereignty fell by the massacre known as the "Sicilian Vespers," in 1282, and the end of the century finds southern Italy under Spanish rule.

Such was the state of European politics during this wonderful century: In Italy and Germany, confusion;

in France, decay of feudalism and tendency to absolute monarchy; in England, growth of parliamentary power and strengthening of constitutional monarchy.

From political events to social affairs in Europe the transition is easy, and we shall here find a more immediate and influential connection with the pulpit.

The mighty impulse of the crusades was felt in every part of the social order of Europe during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and with this were united many other forces which contributed to the activity and progress of men during that stirring era.

The crusaders and their followers came in contact with many wares and luxuries hitherto unknown or little known in the West, and they brought home with them a taste for these things. All this stimulated trade, and the merchants became a wealthier and more considerable class of society. Venice and Genoa especially attained to great power and renown, but other Italian cities shared the new prosperity with them. Nor was the new trading impulse confined to Italy. Inland and international trade also was marvellously stimulated, and the cities of Germany, France, the Netherlands, and even England, felt the quickening touch of business. Fairs were held for exchange of wares between the merchants, and these occasions were important not only to the merchants themselves, but to all others. The robber baron, as well as the petty thief, was there; the fine dame, and the shameless courtesan; the gay youth in search of pleasure, and the wondering peasant gazing at the sights; the preacher, too, was on hand, and used his chance to rebuke sin and say a word for Our Lady and the saints. Along with the merchant, the banker and the usurer grew rich. Lending money at interest was esteemed a sin, and the usurer and the Jew, together with the heretic, receive special attention from the preachers. This commercial activity stimulated others, as is ever the case, and thus the whole realm of trade, finance, and labor received in this age an impulse which has endured through all the following centuries of western commerce.

The king and nobles were at the top of the social order and the clergy mingled freely with them, receiving and giving influences both for good and ill. The serving

classes—house-servants and tillers of the soil—their-
selves divided into various orders, which we need not stop to describe, were at the bottom of the social pyramid. But now between these a new order rises, or, more exactly, an old but hitherto little regarded order grows into wealth and power. The decay of feudalism and the growth of the cities by trade give now to the citizen merchant or banker a new importance and power in the social order. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries we see that great power in its formative stage, in its crude yet vigorous youth; but even thus the young giant gives promise of his coming power, when he shall be the regnant chief in western civilization. The burghers, or men of the middle class, must be henceforth recognized and dealt with as a power in all social life. Their wealth makes them the envy of the lower class, the spoil of the upper; and their struggle to secure their rights, personal and civic, as against the buttressed power of kings and lords, is in large measure the history of social and political progress for ages to come.

It is needless to say that the intellectual life of the European peoples received a powerful uplift and showed marvellous development in this period. There is a more general diffusion of knowledge. Monks and theologians not only hold their places of leadership, but they go far beyond the heights of former days. As before noticed, their ranks are recruited from all classes, so that culture, like religion, is less affected by caste than the political and social spheres. But now the wealth and leisure of the burgher class afford their sons the means of higher culture, and many of them are found among the earnest students of the time. Nor is even the ruling class untouched by the new zeal for learning. Kings and nobles are not only patrons, but in some cases also the pursuers and possessors of culture. Frederick II., the brilliant and ill-fated emperor, was a man of letters, and is said to have preferred Italy to Germany as a residence, because he could better gratify his scholarly tastes in the southern land.

The universities of Europe arose in this age, they were crowded with students, and they greatly extended the range of studies pursued before. To the seven liberal

arts—the *trivium* and *quadrivium*—there were added now the pursuit of law and medicine, and above all of theology. This last was the *scientia scientiarum* of the times. The older schools, perhaps especially those of Charlemagne, had prepared the way for the universities. In this period we find them in Italy, Spain, France, and England. Not till the fourteenth century did they begin their wonderful history in Germany with the foundation of the University of Prague in 1348. About 1250 Robert of Sorbon founded (but upon preceding institutions) the famous school for theology at the University of Paris, which, as the “Sorbonne,” has perpetuated the name of his birthplace. That university was already distinguished for the teaching of theology, but this foundation added greatly to its power and fame. Medicine was especially cultivated at Salerno, and law at Bologna. Oxford and Cambridge also attracted students in the various schools. The number of students reached grand proportions. This was especially true at Paris, where, it is said—though it seems an evident exaggeration—that on one occasion the University supplied 20,000 persons to march in the funeral procession of some noted man. The life of the students was marked by many of the characteristics which in all ages have been recognized as the students’ own. Many were studious and lived hard for learning’s sake, many were idle and spendthrift, coming only for the name of the thing and on pleasure bent; many were disorderly and hard to manage, so that the perennial feud of “town and gown” was a feature of the age, and all were affected with the class spirit, the student way, toward faculty, town, each other and the world in general.

But academic learning was by no means the only intellectual sign of the times. Literature and art likewise had their place of influence. In England the promising and comparatively early development of Saxon literature had received a check and turn by the Norman invasion, but the seed and soil were both ready, and in the fourteenth century Chaucer leads in the founding of English literature properly speaking. In France the troubadours and other poets in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are founding modern French literature, and in Germany the minnesingers are doing like service, while the great

national epic of the Nibelungen probably receives in the thirteenth century the form in which we now have it. In Italy the close of that same century is immortalized by the genius of Dante, and the way is prepared for Petrarch and Boccaccio in the fourteenth. In the sphere of art, sculpture and painting are yet crude, waiting for the kindling of the Renaissance; and music, though one of the seven academic arts, must wait yet longer for its thoroughly artistic development; but architecture achieves great triumphs in the castles, and especially the cathedrals, of that prolific age—monuments alike to the growth of art and to the revival, power and permanence of the religious feeling.

This brings us now to pay some attention to the affairs of the papacy, the clergy, and the general interests of religion in Europe during this age.

At the turn of the century (1198-1216) there sat upon the papal throne the greatest of all the popes—Innocent III. As the vicegerent of Christ and the successor of Peter he claimed sovereignty over all the nations of the earth. He reduced John of England to abject submission, and carried it with a high hand toward Germany, but encountered a serious and tough resistance at the hands of Philip Augustus of France. After him the brilliant emperor Frederick II.—grandson of Barbarossa—conducted the struggle against several popes in succession. He failed. At his death in 1250 the issue lay on the papal side, but both parties were exhausted, and the papacy, weakened from its long struggle, and in the hands of less able and vigorous pontiffs, entered a period of decay. It is true that Boniface VIII. (1294-1303) powerfully reasserted and even extended the claims of Innocent, but Philip the Fair of France was more than a match for the astute Cajetan. After Boniface the papacy was for a long time subservient to France.

In regard to the lower clergy the period offers a number of interesting points. The distinction of secular (those who lived in the world) and regular (those who lived under monastic rule) not only continues, but receives emphasis during this time. The regulars acquire a greater relative importance for three reasons: (1) The reforms in discipline instituted toward the close of the eleventh century were not wholly fruitless; the study

of scholasticism and the contemplation of mysticism, together with other influences, combined to make the regular clergy as a rule superior in character and attainments to the seculars. (2) The example, the personal magnetism and eloquence, the indomitable energy, the widespread influence of Bernard of Clairvaux in the twelfth century gave to monasticism a new and long-abiding impulse. Old orders were quickened and new ones created, and monasteries were founded in all lands. (3) The founding of the two great preaching orders of Francis and Dominic in the thirteenth century, their early enthusiasm and comparative purity, gave a fresh turn to monastic life and influence. We shall see later the more particular relation of these orders to preaching. Among the different orders, and between the seculars and regulars as classes, there was great rivalry. The seculars and regulars accused each other of all sorts of evils. Some allowance must be made for partisan dislike, but no doubt there was ground enough for serious charges.

Some of the secular priests and prelates were men of high character and gifts, true to their calling and earnest for all that was good as they saw it. Others were ambitious, selfish, avaricious, luxurious and corrupt. Among the monks there were not wanting men of holy character, of high intellectual worth and culture, of intense and unselfish devotion. Yet among these too the monastic vices found place. There were the lazy, the garrulous, the grasping, and even those who were unfaithful in spirit and letter to the stern vows of their order. On the whole, in this period, the balance of character and influence lies in favor of the regulars. Their decline comes later.

Such a clergy as this, marked by both personal and artificial distinctions, it was to whom were confided the religious interests of Western Europe, so far as those interests were included and represented in the dominant Catholic church. The heretics had teachers and leaders of their own; but the generally accepted religious guides of the people in the centuries under our review were the Catholic clergy. These performed in great city cathedral or little village church the offices of the Christian worship as it was then conducted; they read the Scriptures, preached, prayed, sang, said masses, and heard

confessions; they performed funerals and marriages and baptisms; they instructed the ignorant, comforted the sorrowing, visited the sick, cheered the dying, helped the penitent, succored the poor; sometimes they rebuked the sins of the great, and sometimes, alas! they imitated them; they moved among all classes of society, an influence for good, though often tainted with acknowledged evil; and such as they were, frail and faulty at best, they stood as the moral and spiritual teachers of the people, the ofttimes erring, but often also the sincere and humble representatives of the kingdom of God among men.

We come now to consider the state of religion among the people during this period, and only very general terms can be employed in undertaking to describe it; for in so long a time, in so many different places, there was necessarily a great variety of phases and phenomena. Yet the mediæval life was so slow as compared with that of our times, and the unity of the Catholic church was so little broken as compared with sectarian developments since the Reformation, that there was more of sameness in the general type of religious life in all Europe than would on first view seem likely.

The religious life of mankind has ever been characterized by ebbs and flows of feeling; and this was true within the period we have in view. About the time of the first crusade there was a great wave of religious enthusiasm, which found expression in that great movement. This movement was not confined to the clergy—it took hold of king and lord and vassal and serf, and even of the children. In the twelfth century this revival had its ups and downs, but was on the whole fairly well sustained; early in the thirteenth the great preaching orders started another and a different kind of religious enthusiasm—gathering great crowds to hear the preaching of the more popular friars. Toward the end of that century and in the fourteenth and fifteenth there is marked decline.

For the rest the attitude of men to religion and morals was not so strikingly different from that of all the Christian ages as to challenge attention. The works of Bourgain¹ and of Lecoy de la Marche² give striking pic-

¹ *La Chaire Française au XII^{me} Siècle.*

² *La Chaire Française au Moyen Age, principalement au XIII^{me} Siècle.*

tures of society as portrayed in the sermons of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; and from many other sources also we may be able to construct an outline view of the part played by religion in the life of those far-off times.

There were, first of all, among the people as among the clergy, the sincerely pious and devout, who loved God, made little of worldly things, and tried to live according to the teachings of the church. They had their representatives in all classes, from the saintly Louis IX. of France down to the humble peasant. As among the priests so among the people there was the grand army of the half-way religious—with all grades of half-way-ness. Nominally religious, connected with the church, sometimes penitent, often errant, and always worldly, they were the terror and the burden of the truly holy in the earth. In the clergy they might be worldly prelates, living in wealth and luxury, or doubters like Abelard, outwardly conforming to the church, but secretly doubting and expressing as much as they dared without losing their places; among the rulers they might be of the type of Frederick II., ambitious, selfish, bent on glory and power, regarded as a heretic, anathematized by religious authority, and yet with an outward, nominal, occasional sort of regard for religion. There was the jolly burgher, who loved his ducats and his wine, but went to church and communicated perhaps once a year; there was the gay worldling on pleasure bent, and his dame or mistress, with passion for dress and finery, who yet upon occasion could be very pious in talk or passing emotion. And, of course, the utterly irreligious, “who feared not God, neither regarded man,” were to be found in all the walks of life. There were the superstitious and the credulous, fearing all things and preyed upon by designers of every sort. And there, too, are the so-called “heretics,” refusing the supremacy of the Roman church, some of them no doubt all wild with disorder and rebellion, some half-crazy with fanaticism and follies, but not a few also who yearned for and sought to exemplify and establish a pure New Testament religion over against the pretensions and corruptions of Rome.

After discussing with great clearness and interest the state of society, as presented in the sermons of the thir-

teenth century, Lecoy de la Marche concludes his admirable book with this striking paragraph: "Our guides have complacently pointed out to us the weaknesses of the prelates and monks, the abuses of power by the princes, the robberies of the lords and their retainers, the ambitions of the burghers, the ruses of the merchants and usurers, the coarseness of the sailors, of the laborers, of the servants, the artifices and coquetry of the women, the peccadilloes of the students. They have given us in a rapid view the state of knowledge, the received ideas in the matter of government, of commerce, of education, the development given to each branch of the human sciences. And by the light of their torch that vast panorama has appeared to us under a darker color than the reality. By an optical illusion common to the moralists of all ages they have judged their contemporaries to be the worst of the generations. 'We are the dregs of the centuries,' says Jacques de Vitry in so many words—*Nos sumus in quos faeces saeculorum devenerunt*. But at the bottom it is the same interests, the same passions, the same struggles which fill all the pages of the great book of history, and at any moment that it is studied the human heart is found to be such as it has been, is, and will be. There is only diversity in the remedies applied to the plagues, and it is when those remedies are furnished by religion that the cure is least distant. The harshness of the criticisms of the pulpit carries indeed its own corrective in itself: so much ardor to combat evil proves that perfection was sought; so much animosity against vice shows what value was attached to virtue."

2. GENERAL VIEW OF PREACHING IN THE CENTURY

Passing on to take a view of preaching itself at this great epoch in European history, we find that the revival which distinguished the twelfth century went on with great power and with some new features into its successor; and it was not until late in the thirteenth century that the inevitable reaction began to appear. One of the evidences or elements of this continued revival was the enormous crowds which are reported to have gathered to hear the popular preachers. Even when we make allowances for over-estimates and subsequent exaggerations it still re-

mains probably true that the largest audiences ever gathered to hear preaching were characteristic of this period. It seems that Berthold and Antony had larger crowds than Whitefield in the eighteenth or Moody in the nineteenth century. The effects of preaching on life and conduct were also immediate and profound. Conversion and its fruits are abundantly reported in the contemporary accounts. The martial and adventurous excitement of the crusades had given place to a more spiritual and moral movement, or, to speak more accurately, these gained comparatively on the other.

The most important and significant movement in the first part of the century was the founding and early work of the two great preaching orders of monks, the Franciscans and Dominicans. The primary object of these institutions was to preach. The spur to the establishment of the Dominicans was found in the failure of the pope's emissaries to overcome heresy in the south of France, and Dominic conceived it would be best to meet the sectaries in their own way by sending forth preachers among the people who should live plainly and be diligent in preaching. The Franciscans came into being in response to the example and call of Francis of Assisi, who saw the people in need of the word of God, and went forth in lowly poverty to bring them the message of grace and love. These orders spread very rapidly in the first half of the century, and the friars went everywhere preaching the word. They even went on foreign missions to Africa and Asia. While the primary idea of Dominic was to meet heresy, and so the order was chiefly devoted to teaching, it yet became assimilated to the evangelistic character of the Franciscans, and they in turn, through rivalry, at a later period, paid more attention to learning. In the beginning these orders were comparatively pure, and were fired with the zeal and spirit of their founders. As they grew in numbers, learning and influence they became more worldly, and their power for good decreased. But through this century, or to very near its close, they were in the flourishing period of their character and power.

But though there was much and very effective preaching in this century, and though it attracted great multitudes of hearers, yet in quality and character it did not

escape the faults inherited from the long ages of departure from a true Biblical standard. When we compare the preaching of the thirteenth century with that of the two other culminating periods—the fourth and the sixteenth—which preceded and followed it, we shall find that in respect of real Biblical content and sound evangelical character it falls immeasurably below them. It was a sadly distorted gospel which was preached in the thirteenth century. It had suffered from mutilation, perversion, and accretion. The use of Scripture was often only sad misuse—it was either neglected wholly or served merely as a pretext for wholly unscriptural or even antisciptural teachings. Wild allegorizing, puerile fancies, forced meanings and applications, gross misunderstanding, and sometimes positive irreverence, were only too common in the handling of the word of God. The best preachers were not free from some of these faults, and those of lower grade were of course worse still. The merit of works, the saving value of ordinances, penances, and the like, were presented, to the detriment of gospel truth and sound Christian morals. The glory of the Virgin, the legends of saints and martyrs crowded, and sometimes crowded out, the history and doctrine of Scripture. Scholastic and mystic subtleties often passed beyond the comprehension of the hearers and left the hungry sheep looking up unfed. Yet amid all this failure and perversion the main distinctive truths of Christianity were ably and sincerely presented, and by many earnest voices the saving power of Christ was told, and thousands were brought to his cross. Sin was searchingly analyzed and boldly denounced, and to the ever-present springs of human action appeal was constantly made.

The preachers of the century may be grouped now on a new principle, according to the tendencies of thought and life which actuated them. These tendencies, or modes of thought and life, were the scholastic, the popular, and the mystic. They flowed freely through all the preaching of the age in greater or less volume, and sometimes the same man would combine in his preaching two, or even all three, of these elements. The scholastic magnified the intellectual, the popular the practical, and the

mystic the deeper spiritual aspects of the religious life. In this chapter we shall consider the first two.

3. SCHOLASTIC PREACHING AND PREACHERS

Scholasticism did not begin nor end in the thirteenth century, but it reached its strongest influence and had its greatest representatives in that time; and this is therefore the most appropriate place to note its influence on preaching. Every great movement in philosophy and theology naturally influences the preaching of the age in which it has vogue, and finds defenders and opponents in the pulpit as well as those who are more or less directly moulded by it. Illustrations are numerous, and those of our own time are ready to hand. But our concern here is with scholasticism and its influence upon the preaching of this great thirteenth century.

What is scholasticism? The words scholastic and schoolmen sufficiently indicate the fact that what is called scholasticism was primarily and chiefly an affair of the schools. Anselm in the eleventh century and Abelard in the twelfth are very great names among scholastic preachers of former times, and they were both great teachers, one representing the rigidly orthodox, the other the freer mode of thinking in theology. Scholasticism is the combination of theology and philosophy. It is the application of the Aristotelian logic to the interpretation of Scripture and the deductions of theology. It is the effort and method whereby the speculations of the intellect on the data furnished by church dogmas may be by logical processes harmonized with those dogmas. It was the serious attempt of acute and minute reasoning to give itself the freest possible exercise and largest possible scope within the trammels imposed by ecclesiastical authority and by accepted beliefs regarded as fundamental and final. Scholasticism was a giant in bonds. Perhaps never has the human intellect more strikingly exhibited three of its greatest powers: speculation, analysis, ratiocination. In regard to it the question is not as to the intellectual power involved, but as to data and ends—as to the soundness of the premises, the breadth of the inductions, and the value of the conclusions, rather than as to the ability to perceive, deduce, and classify the material

of thought. In penetration and acuteness of insight, in luminous and exhaustive arrangement of matter, and in logical severity and conclusiveness, those old schoolmen were very great thinkers. As a method scholasticism was sure to need and to receive modification; as a philosophy it could no more be final than those held by the old Greeks, or by the more recent German and English thinkers; but as the occupation of the purest and highest intellects of the thirteenth and contiguous centuries it at least deserves respectful consideration at the hands of the philosopher and the historian.

As we shall see, some of the great scholastics were preachers, but the influence of scholasticism upon preaching is not represented in these alone. A vigorous and prevalent method of treating intellectual problems in any age always affects many who cannot be classed with the philosophers, and thus the general mental habits of an age are colored by the dominant philosophy, whether it be accepted or denied, understood or misconceived. The contribution of scholasticism to preaching had regard to both matter and form. In respect to the first the metaphysical subtleties, hairsplitting distinctions, attenuated reasonings, the dogmas, fancies, speculations about things of no particular consequence then or now, all became in some measure the possession of the pulpit. Men of less ability than the great doctors would be sure to pick up the phrases and methods of the leaders of thought without always knowing what they were about.

In the matter of form the contribution of scholasticism to preaching is more important and enduring. The rage for minute analysis was carried too far, but it made the sermon henceforth a more orderly and logical address than it ever had been even in the hands of Chrysostom and Augustine, not to mention the invertebrate homilies of the ages of decline. From now on the sermon must include among the elements of its ideal completeness clear distinction and logical treatment of its material. The tendency will go too far, degenerate, become tedious, ridiculous even—but it will stay. And so at least one of the prime essentials of effective pulpit discourse owes a debt to the scholastic method.

Owing to the rise of the preaching orders of monks

and to other causes, the popular phase of preaching was prominent earlier in the century than the scholastic; and it was not until these orders themselves fell under the influence of the schools and produced great scholars that we find the scholastic method very pronounced and powerful in the pulpit. Still in the early part of the century there are a few notable men, distinguished prelates, who, because of their learning and general position, belong among the scholastic rather than among the popular preachers. Among them are two celebrated English bishops who claim brief notice as preachers.

Stephen Langton (d. 1228) was born in Yorkshire about the middle of the twelfth century, but was educated chiefly at Paris, where he made a warm friendship with the gifted Italian, Lothario, better known as the greatest pope—Innocent III. In 1198 Innocent promptly made his friend a member of the papal household, and in 1206 appointed him a cardinal. The next year, through the influence of the pope, he was chosen by the canons archbishop of Canterbury. But he was not acceptable to King John, and over his investiture there arose the famous controversy between pope and king in which John was at last forced to yield, and in 1213 Langton took charge of his office. He stood firmly for the country's liberty and bore no mean part in framing and securing Magna Charta. He remained in peaceful possession of his diocese till his death in 1228.

There are numbers of unpublished sermons of his cited by Oudin,¹ and Lecoy de la Marche has found and studied thirty-five of these, somewhat jumbled in one collection, and besides a complete and homogeneous series in a manuscript at Ste. Genéviève. They show some real oratorical talent, and as the learned critic observes, "pass completely beyond the coldness and banality only too common in the productions of the time." We are much indebted to the French scholar for having thus shown that this famous English prelate and patriot was also a preacher of no ordinary force.

¹ See Lecoy de la Marche, *Pars I.*, chap. IV., from whom the account in the text is chiefly derived. He discusses Langton among the French preachers because of his education and lecturing at Paris and his long sojourn in France.

The renowned bishop of Lincoln, Robert Greathead (better known in its old French form, Grosseteste; d. 1253), also belongs here. He is called ¹ "in some respects the most distinguished of all the English mediæval prelates as regards his personal influence both over the men of his time and its literature." Born of humble parents, he yet obtained education at Oxford and at Paris, and became one of the most learned men of the day. He held several subordinate places in the English church, and was finally made bishop of Lincoln in 1235. He was a diligent bishop, strict in discipline and vigorous in administration of affairs. Though a sincere and duty-loving man, he was hasty in temper and somewhat harsh in manner, and so he made enemies and had many a quarrel on his hands. He did not fail to include among his opponents several of the popes, who desired to put into office men whom the honest and sturdy Englishman deemed unfit. He also stood by Magna Charta, and was a friend of Simon de Montfort. But amid all these official cares he was a diligent preacher, and reports of about forty of his sermons remain. The writer quoted above remarks, "Of those who speak of him, one is especially struck by his courage, another by his universal knowledge, a third by his subtlety in interpreting Scripture, and a fourth by his frequent preaching."

Elinand,² or Helinand (d.c. 1225), was born in France, but of Flemish parents who had fled thither. He was as a youth devoted to learning, but before his conversion was much given to the pleasures of the world. After that he became very pious and joined the Cistercian order of monks at Froidmont. His learning was ample and accurate. He had the classic and ecclesiastical writers at his fingers' ends, quoting from them with ease, frequency and effect in his sermons. In one of these³ he quotes Horace, Virgil, Cicero, Ovid, Statius, Lucan, Terence, Quintilian, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Leo I., and alludes to Bernard, Dunstan, and others. He was himself a writer of repute, his historical work being still one of the important sources of information for his period.

¹ Article in *Ency. Brit.*

² *Works* and notice of his life in Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, tom. 112, col. 481 ss.

³ Sermon XV., on the Ascension; Migne, *l. c.*

As a preacher he was a trifle pedantic, and did not rise above the manner and matter of his age; but he shows warmth of feeling and does not fail to warn his hearers against the sins of the time. In the very sermon in which he displays so much learning he warns the monks, to whom the sermon was addressed, against seeking for itself the learning of this world. He says, "Everywhere knowledge is sought, nowhere life; without which not only is nothing profitable, but even knowledge is nothing. For this reason not even knowledge itself is found, because it is not sought where it is, that is, in the book of life, which also is the book of knowledge, namely, in him who is the Wisdom of God, in whom all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hid."

Among the famous prelates and scholars and preachers of the early thirteenth century a good place belongs to Jacques de Vitry (Jacobus de Vitriaco; d. 1240), priest in France, bishop in Palestine, cardinal in Italy.¹ Born probably at Vitry (some say Argenteuil) about 1180, he was early attracted to Oigny by the fame and piety of the noted Beguine, Mary of Oigny, who took a motherly interest in her friend as long as she lived. He studied at Paris and was ordained to the priesthood, and, returning to Oigny, he soon became known for his learning and his oratorical talent. About 1213 he was commissioned by Innocent III. to preach in Belgium the crusade against the Albigenses in the south of France. He had great success and went with the crusaders, preaching both to them and to the heretics, but naturally without much success in case of the latter. Soon after this he was charged by the same pope to preach a new crusade to the Holy Land, and met with much success. Meantime he was chosen by the canons of Acre to be their bishop. On the way to Rome to be set apart to his far-off charge he found at Perugia the lifeless body of the great pope—who had suddenly died there in June, 1216—lying shamefully neglected in the church of St. Laurence. The crowd of attendants had hurried to Rome to the new election! Struck by this evidence of the emptiness of earthly glory, he went on to Rome, where he was

¹ Lecoy de la Marche, p. 53 et suiv.; and the article in *Wetzer und Welte*.

kindly received by the newly elected pope, Honorius III., one of whose first official acts was to consecrate Jacques as bishop of Acre in Palestine. He discharged the onerous duties of his diocese with faithfulness and ability for some years, and then begged that his resignation be accepted. This was reluctantly granted, and he returned to his beloved Oigny for a short rest. Thence he was called by his friend Pope Gregory IX. and made cardinal bishop of Tusculum (or Frascati), and took up his residence in Rome till his death in 1240.

Jacques de Vitry was in many ways a very remarkable man. Celebrated as a writer, especially of history, his account of affairs in Europe and the East during his lifetime is of great value to historians. As a preacher he was known in many countries, but especially in France. A contemporary, quoted by Lecoy de la Marche, says, "His word moved France as it had not been moved within the memory of man." During his residence at Rome he made a collection of his sermons which remains (partly in manuscript), and is said to be unusual for independence and originality. The first part¹ contains sermons of different lengths, style, etc., suited to different audiences, on the usual subjects of the feasts, the saints, and the like. The second part, yet unpublished, consists of seventy-four sermons addressed to "prelates and priests; canons and regular clergy; scholars; judges and lawyers; theologians and preachers; black and white monks; sisters, gray, white, and Cistercian; regular canons; hermits and recluses; friars Minorites; brothers of the order of the Temple; brothers Hospitallers, and guardians of the sick; lepers and infirm; poor and afflicted, people in sorrow; crusaders; pilgrims; nobles and knights; citizens; merchants and bankers; laborers and vine-dressers; artisans; sailors; servants and domestics; married people; widows and celibates; young girls; children and youth." In the prologue he says: "The greatest prudence and the greatest discernment are necessary in preaching. The same specific does not suit everybody. The physician who would cure all eyes with the same salve is a fool; and that which the eye needs the foot does not." He has great variety in his preaching, and is happy and fruitful in the use of illustration.

¹ Adduced by Lecoy de la Marche, *op. cit.*

At least mention should be made here of the celebrated founder of the theological college—the Sorbonne—of the University of Paris, Robert (d. 1274), who was born at Sorbon near Rheims, was canon at Cambrai, later at Paris, and chaplain to the pious king Louis IX. He was not greatly learned, but a respectable scholar. Some discourses,¹ besides other writings, remain from him. “They contain few passages of an elevated eloquence, but they are rich in moral traits, in examples of all sorts, and in vestiges of the French language, though written in Latin.”

Preëminently representative of the dominant scholastic mode of thought were two: Albert, called the Great, and his greater pupil, Thomas Aquinas.

Albert² (d. 1280), to whom was given the epithet Magnus, was born in southern Germany, entered the Dominican order at Padua, was highly educated in the learning of the time, became one of the most famous and influential teachers of his age, and prior of the Dominican abbey and school at Cologne. Here he did most of his work as professor and preacher, but also lectured for a time at the University of Paris, whence he returned to Cologne for the remainder of his life, and died there in 1280. He was called “Doctor Universalis.”

Several sets of sermons are attributed to him, but many of these are certainly spurious,³ and perhaps not all the others can be confidently accepted as genuine. But the very fact that so many sermons were put forth under his great name is evidence of his power as a preacher and his influence upon preaching. Those sermons which may be most probably accounted genuine are in the scholastic method, and were very influential in giving vogue and authority to it. There is a set on the festivals and saints’ days of which Christlieb⁴ says: “By thematic form, through practical use of the text, and simple popularity they are distinguished above many.” But his chief fame as preacher rests on another set on the Sacraments. Among them is a series on one text: Prov. 9:5, “Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have

¹ Lecoy de la M., *op. cit.*

² Most of the authorities previously noted.

³ Cruel discusses them under the title, “Pseudo-Albert.”

⁴ Art. in Herzog, Bd. 18, supplement.

mingled." Albert takes these words of the personified wisdom as being those of the Lord Jesus Christ, and a prophecy of the Lord's Supper. On the basis of this interpretation he proceeds through a number of sermons to discuss—in the characteristic way of divisions, subdivisions and distinctions—the institution, the form, the miracle, the participation, and so on, of the Lord's Supper. Almost certainly not his, but called his, and illustrative of his and the scholastic method in general, is a greatly used and prized so-called *Mariale*, that is, a series of sermons or sketches on the Virgin. The text, Luke 1:26, 27—the mission of Gabriel to Mary at Nazareth—was used to suggest a set of two hundred and thirty questions in regard to Mary. Here by the sophistical dialectics of scholasticism there is attributed to the Virgin all sorts of knowledge, as of grammar, rhetoric, law, and other things.

Albert's great fame is merged into and surpassed by that of his renowned pupil, Thomas Aquinas (1227-1274).¹ This greatest representative of the scholastic theology was born of noble parents at Aquino, near Naples, in the year after the death of Francis of Assisi. At five years of age he was sent to be educated at the well-known Benedictine monastery of Monte Cassino, then under the care of an uncle of Thomas. He was a quiet and thoughtful boy, and already, like Origen of old, surprised his teachers by his precocious questions on profound subjects of theology. At this time Italy was rent by the quarrel between the papacy and the emperor Frederick II.—the Guelf and Ghibelline factions. When Thomas was twelve years old the monastery was burned by the soldiers of Frederick, and the boy returned to his home. Soon he was sent to the University of Naples, where after a time he fell under the influence of the Dominicans, and while still a youth joined that order. This step was greatly against the pride and the tastes of his family, who could not abide the thought that their well-born and gifted Thomas should be a mendicant monk, strolling about the country barefoot and preaching. He was fitted for higher things in the church than this. The Domini-

¹ *Works* in the great Paris ed. of Drioux; *Life*, by Vaughan; notices and accounts in many authorities.

cans tried to smuggle him off to France, but he was captured by his brothers, who were officers in the imperial army, and, with his mother's consent, was made a prisoner in his own father's castle. This lasted for two years, during which time it is said that by his father's instigation he was subjected to temptation in order to corrupt him. But this was resisted, and his enforced leisure was devoted to higher things. Three books were the companions of his captivity—the Bible, some works of Aristotle, and the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, one of the fathers of scholasticism. These he mastered thoroughly, and his subsequent life and labors show also how thoroughly they had mastered him. After two years his family so far relented that he was set at liberty, and later his mother gave up her opposition to his being a Dominican. Thomas was then sent to Cologne to study under Albert the Great. The young man was of heavy build, reserved and shy. His companions nicknamed him *bos mutus*—the “dumb ox.” But one day Albert set him to defend a thesis, and he did it with such marked ability that the great teacher said, “You call him the dumb ox, but some day his lowing will fill the world.” When in 1245 Albert was sent to the University of Paris to lecture for awhile Thomas accompanied him and enjoyed a first acquaintance with that renowned seat of learning. On Albert's return to Cologne Thomas was for four years his beloved master's assistant teacher, and then was sent back to Paris to study for his degrees. After several years more he was made a doctor the same day with his beloved friend Bonaventura of the Franciscan order. What a long period of studious preparation before he took up in earnest the work of his life!

Ready now for that work the young doctor Thomas Aquinas found his hands full as soon as he took hold. One of his first successes was won in a controversy with the brilliant William of St. Amour, who, in a treatise, had attacked the preaching orders. Thomas was called to Italy by the pope to defend the friars, and he achieved a brilliant success. He became very popular as preacher and lecturer, and was sent by the authorities of his order to many different places to teach and preach. Paris, Bologna, Naples, Rome itself, were the scenes of his triumphs in pulpit and chair. It was thus that the “dumb

ox" of former days became changed into the "angel of the schools," the *doctor angelicus* to admiring hearers and readers. But the years of his activity were not to be very many, though prodigiously fruitful. In the early spring of 1274 a council was called at Lyons to consider what might be done to reunite the Greek and Latin churches. Pope Gregory X. sent Thomas, who was then in Rome, to attend the council and advise on points of doctrine. He was taken sick on the way, and died at Fossa Nuova, in north Italy, March, 1274, in the forty-eighth year of his age.

As a theologian, his vast and comprehensive work, the *Summa Theologiæ*, witnesses to his industry, his wonderful acquirements, his logical power, his depth and acuteness of thought, his Catholic orthodoxy. As a teacher and disputant, his title of "angelic doctor" and his numerous treatises reveal something of his popularity and power. As a man and Christian, the story of his life tells of his purity, his gentleness, his patience, his diligence; the respect and admiration of his own and later times testify to the nobility of his character; his love for Albert his master, and Bonaventura his friend, shows the heart of the man; and his humble piety toward his God is illustrated in the tradition of later days, which tells that once while he was praying before a crucifix, the Saviour said to him, "Thomas, thou hast written well of me; what reward wilt thou have for thy labor?" And the saint replied, "Lord, none but thee."¹

But it is in his quality and work as a preacher that we are here concerned with the great theologian, Aquinas. On his journeys and during his residences at various places as professor and lecturer he was, sometimes to monks and pupils, sometimes on great ecclesiastical occasions, and often too to the common people, a preacher of great acceptance and power. He must have preached without manuscript and in the language of the people, but the brief Latin sketches and outlines of his sermons which remain can give us no just conception of his power before an audience. The current Catholic orthodoxy, as

¹ *Acta Sanctorum*, Mart., die VII., 34: "Thoma, de me bene scripsisti: quam recipies a me pro tuo labore mercedem? Qui respondit, Domine, non nisi te."

he has himself interpreted it in his great books, formed the doctrinal content of his preaching; and there can be little doubt that the scholastic analysis and the argumentative method characterized even his popular sermons; but it is a comfort to know that the people delighted to hear him. Broadus¹ says of him: "Amid the immense and amazing mass of his works are many brief discourses, and treatises which were originally discourses, marked by clearness, simplicity and practical point. He is not highly imaginative, nor flowing in expression; the sentences are short, and everything runs into division and subdivision, usually by threes. But while there is no ornament, and no swelling passion, he uses many homely and lively comparisons, for explanation as well as for argument." It goes without saying that as a child of his time and heir of his past he does not escape the allegorizing and forcing of Scripture which we have come to recognize as inevitable in all mediæval preaching. The following outlines will serve as illustrations of his method.²

Outline of a sermon on the

Coming of the King. Matt. 21:5. First Sunday in Advent.

I. The Dignity of Him Who Comes. (1) A merciful King—in sparing. Isa. 16:5. (2) A just King—in judging. Isa. 34; 16:5. (3) A good King—in rewarding. (4) A wise King—in governing. Ps. 73:1. (5) A terrible King. Jer. 23:5. (6) An omnipotent King. Est. [Apoc.] 13:9. (7) An eternal King. Jer. 10:10; Luke 1:33.

II. The Utility of His Coming. Sevenfold: (1) For the illumination of the world. Jno. 8:12; 1:9. (2) For the spoliation of hell. Hos. 13:14; Zech. 9:11. (3) For the reparation of heaven. Eph. 1:10. (4) For the destruction of sin. Heb. 2:14, 15. (5) For the vanquishment of the devil. Rom. 6:6. (6) For the reconciliation of man with God. Rom. 5:10. (7) For the beatification of man. Jno. 3:16.

¹ *Hist. Prea.*, p. 106 f.

² One of the outlines is taken from the Drioux ed. of the Works, the other two from an English translation of some of his sermons: *The Homilies of S. Thomas Aquinas upon the Epistles and Gospels for the Sundays of the Christian Year*; translated by John M. Ashley, Lond., 1873.

III. The Manner of His Coming. In meekness, for four reasons: (1) That he might more easily correct the wicked. Psl. 89:10 [Vulg.]. (2) That he might show to all his lowliness. Ecclus. [Apoc.] 3:19. (3) That he might draw the sheep to himself, and multiply to himself a people. 2 Sam. 22:36. [And a quotation from Bernard]. (4) That he might teach meekness. Matt. 11:29. So four things should commend meekness to us: (a) Delivers from evil; (b) Perfects grace, Prov. 3:34; (c) Preserves the soul, Ecclus. [Apoc.] 12:31; (d) Deserves the land of the living, Matt. 5:5.

The Mystical Ship. Matt. 8:23.

Four things are to be considered in this gospel: (1) The entering of Christ and his disciples into a ship. (2) The great tempest in the sea. (3) The prayer of the disciples. (4) The obedience of the storm to the command of Christ. Morally we are taught four things: (1) To enter into holiness of life. (2) That temptations rage after we have entered. (3) In these temptations to cry unto the Lord. (4) To look for a calm according to his will.

The next sermon continues the same subject and shows how a ship symbolizes holiness:

I. The Material. (1) The wood represents righteousness. (2) The iron, strength. (3) The oakum, by which leaks are stopped, temperance. (4) The pitch, charity.

II. The Form. (1) Smallness at the beginning represents grief for sin. (2) Breadth of the middle, hope of eternal joy. (3) Height of stern, fear of eternal punishment. (4) Narrowness of keel, humility.

III. The Uses. (1) To carry men over seas; in holiness we go to heaven. (2) To carry merchandise; in holiness we carry good works. (3) To make war; in holiness we fight against the demons.

4. POPULAR PREACHERS AND PREACHING

We have already had occasion to observe that the distinctive and emphatic thing in the preaching of the early thirteenth century was the missionary or popular element. Vast crowds, popular enthusiasm, some fanaticism and extremes, but likewise conversion to God and amendment of life were some of its features and fruits.

Under the providence of God a number of coöperating causes may be traced as producing at this time so notable an extension in the power and effect of popular preaching. In a general way greater consideration was now given to the people themselves. Along with the decay of feudalism, the rise of the burgher class, the growth of cities, the acquisition of some political significance by the middle class, the general stir and heightened interest in life, which have been elsewhere noted, there came greater longing among the people for larger intellectual and spiritual life. This reached and appealed to the minds and hearts of many of the devout. For a century and more Western Christendom had been trying at intervals to wrest by mighty armed hosts the holy places at Jerusalem from the hands of the infidels, but what was doing to deliver the souls of the masses in Europe and elsewhere from the bondage of sin, of unbelief, of moral decay? The people needed, and Christian men must give them, the gospel of Christ. And the Catholic leaders saw too that many who did not hold the Catholic faith in the traditional and authoritative ways were seeing this need of the people and were spreading heresy among them. So the two motives of a real concern for the people and a jealousy for the Catholic faith were working together to stir up more zeal for preaching in the hearts of some. And these two leading motives became incarnated in two great leaders who now appeared on the scene. Dominic saw that heresy could be more wisely and safely met by preaching the Catholic faith after the manner of the heretics themselves than by persecution or mere churchly teaching; and more devout Francis saw the neglected spiritual condition of the people and heard his call to preach the gospel to the poor. Hence arose the two great orders of preaching monks in whose ranks we find the great popular preachers of the century, and from whom went forth missionaries in many lands at home and abroad. Besides their direct work the example of these preachers had effect on other preachers not of their own companies.

In character and contents the popular preaching was such as has been described as generally prevalent in the age—the current Roman Catholic faith of the Middle

Ages, the traditional allegorical interpretation and other misuses of Scripture, the excessive employment of legends of the saints and other unscriptural material as authoritative, the doctrines of penance, purgatory, and confession, the veneration amounting to worship of the Virgin—all these and other overgrowths upon the gospel we have learned to recognize as characteristics of the mediæval preaching, and they need here be only thus briefly recalled. But we must not forget that along with these things the work of Christ as the Saviour, and the only Saviour, was vividly presented, and the duty of repentance and faith strongly urged together with the practice of the Christian virtues as the fruits and evidences of a real Christian experience. Moreover, the fearful sins of the age—in clergy, nobles, and people—received brave and keen rebuke. These old preachers knew human nature, and they did not hesitate to expose and denounce and try to correct its perennial foibles. Change the language, the allusion to current events, some of the illustrations from prevalent customs and manners, and the main material of their treatment of sin and its remedy would apply to the men and women of to-day as well as to those of the thirteenth century.

In form, the sermons of the popular preachers were largely influenced by the scholastic passion for analysis and minute subdivision. In regard to language they were of course mostly, if not entirely, preached in the vernacular dialects.¹ For illustration and argument there was effective use of every sort of material—legends and tales, fables old and new, the habits (real and imaginary) of animals, the forces of nature (of course oftentimes absurdly misunderstood), the customs of the time, and many other sources, were open books to these prophets of the day. Sometimes queer methods for advertising and effect were resorted to. "Sensational preaching" was by no means unknown. There was many a prototype of the modern Sam Jones variety of "popular" preacher. Tricks and surprises, catchy and coarse illustrations were not infrequent. The humorous was freely employed, and this often degenerated into the burlesque and irreverent.²

¹ See Lecoy de la Marche, as above, p. 184.

² Friar Cuthbert in Longfellow's *Golden Legend* is not overdrawn.

The marvellous was a mighty help in that age of credulity, and it was worked too hard even by the best of the preachers. But the sermons were also popular in the best sense—they found the people, held them, helped them. Vivid allegory and picturing appealed to the imagination, lively dialogue and sharp home-thrust kept the attention, and warm and tender appeals to the better feelings of men were not without effect. Past masters in the art of popular speech, and of handling great crowds in its use, were Antony and Berthold; but though preëminent, they were not alone.

When we name a few of the more notable men who distinguished the annals of popular preaching in the thirteenth century we must not forget the great army of less known and even of now forgotten preachers who in the spirit of these leaders, and in use of the methods which the leaders exemplify, went among the people preaching the word. Contemporary accounts and the considerable number of sermons—many of them anonymous—which have come down from that age, show us that the prominent and well-known names represent a mighty activity, of which they are only the most notable examples.

The first place in our discussion naturally belongs to the two great men who in the early part of this thirteenth century founded the famous orders of preaching friars—the Dominicans and Franciscans.

Dominic¹ (d. 1221), whose real name has been lost sight of in his assumed and canonized one, was born in 1170, of high family, at Calaruega, in Old Castile, Spain. In early childhood he found his pleasure in going to church, in prayers, in self-denial. He was well educated in youth by an uncle, and at the age of fourteen was sent to the University of Valencia, where he studied hard the required general course, and afterwards made a specialty of theology. During his career as a student he was distinguished above all his comrades for diligence and learning, and still more for his piety. He had a tender

¹The chief authority is the *Acta Sanctorum*, August, Vol. I., p. 359 ss. Also, *Vie de Saint Dominique*, by the famous modern Dominican, Lacordaire; *Francis and Dominic*, by J. Herkless, a brief popular account; articles in Wetzer und Welte, and Herzog. Dominic did not leave many writings, and of those ascribed to him the larger part are considered spurious.

heart, and was ever ready to sacrifice himself to duty. Thus early, too, he was deeply concerned for the salvation of men and the conversion of heretics. At the age of twenty-four he was called by bishop Diego of Osma to be canon of his cathedral; and in this office he displayed great zeal and preached very often.

Toward the end of 1203 Alfonso VIII., king of Old Castile, sent bishop Diego on an embassy to Denmark to seek a bride for his son. The bishop chose Dominic for his travelling companion. The mission was successful, and the bishop came back to report, but on the return of the messengers the following year to bring the princess to Spain it was found that she had in the meantime died. From this second journey the bishop and Dominic did not directly return, but having communicated their sad intelligence to the king they crossed the Alps and paid a visit to Rome. All these experiences were helpful in the development of the young priest, but now on this return journey from Rome occurred the turning point in his life.

On their way through the south of France the companions stopped a while at Montpellier, where they found three papal legates living in some style and making futile official attempts to bring back the heretical Albigenses to the Catholic faith. Diego and Dominic saw that these methods were useless, and advised the priests to adopt a simple mode of life, go among the people with humble sincerity and use the methods of preaching and personal persuasion which the heretics themselves employed. The counsellors set the example themselves, and thus in 1205 Dominic began to preach among the Albigenses of Languedoc. About the same time he started in a small way a home of refuge for young women to save them from heresy, and this later came to be the female order of Dominicans, as well as being a sort of beginning for the order proper. This soon came into being. For Dominic's zeal and example won others to his side. He took no active part in the crusade against the Albigenses, but at its close, in 1215, he set about the establishing of his order of preachers. One of his friends, Peter Cellani, gave him a house for the gathering company, the bishop of Toulouse favored and helped the enterprise, and so

did Simon de Montfort. With this good start Dominic went to Rome to gain the pope's consent. As in case of Francis, Innocent III. was very reluctant. He died, however, before the matter was finally disposed of, and his successor, Honorius III., in December, 1216, gave the requisite authorization, and the order of *Fratres Prædicatorum*, or Preaching Friars (Brothers), was fairly established.

Dominic was active in spreading, developing, guiding his order during the rest of his life. He died comparatively young at Bologna in August, 1221. Dominic was himself a preacher of decided ability, and was heard with admiration both by the people and the more cultured audiences of Rome and other places. It is to be regretted that no specimens of his eloquence survive.

Francis (d. 1226), the founder of the order of *Fratres Minores* ("Little Brothers of the Poor"), was born at Assisi in Umbria, central Italy, in 1182.¹ His father, Pietro Bernadone, was a wealthy merchant, worldly, ambitious, and of an evil disposition. He wished his fine and handsome son to figure in society, and was quite willing to supply the requisite means to that end. Francis was of an accommodating spirit in that regard—as most young men would be—and sowed his wild oats pretty freely; dressed well, enjoyed life, and did nothing. But all the while he was secretly dissatisfied at times; the dormant conscience was not dead, the beckoning future forbade rest in an idle and luxurious present. The youth was of a free and generous disposition, kind-hearted, lovable, and popular. With a view to social elevation he enlisted as a soldier in one of the petty Italian wars of the time and was furnished by his father with a fine equipment. He started with his companions on an expedition, but his heart failed him—it is said that he saw a vision—and he returned. Certainly this was not for lack of courage, but because he had no taste for the business.

¹ There is a great literature on Francis. For many reasons he has appealed to sentiment as well as to historic and religious interest. I have found particularly valuable the brilliant work of Sabatier, *Francis of Assisi*, Eng. transl.; a critical study by Walter Goetz in Brieger und Bess *Ztschrft. für Kirchengesch.*, 1901, SS. 362, 525; and for the traditions and atmosphere the *Fioretti di San Francesco*.

Here began his troubles with his father. Filled with strange conflicts, he went to Rome in search of peace. Here he was much impressed by the beggars, and counted it one of the beginnings of his conversion that he was moved to tender sympathy toward the lepers, for whom, in his fastidious days, he had entertained a sickening aversion. It is said that he embraced one of these outcasts and gave him his cloak. The turning point soon came. It was in 1206 while he was praying before a crucifix in the church of St. Damian, near Assisi, that his soul found peace in his Saviour, and his resolution to break with the world and devote himself to the service of his Lord was taken.

A stormy scene with his father followed. Pietro appeared with his son before some ecclesiastical or civil tribunal and made complaint of his disobedience. Francis declared he could no longer walk in the ways his father had planned for him, that all he now had belonging to his father was the clothing he had on. Stripping himself of all, he gave the clothes to Pietro, and ran out; some one kindly threw a cloak about the naked youth as he left, and with this only garment he went to the church of St. Damian to pray and consider his future course. For clothing and food the erstwhile dainty and luxurious Francis was now for the rest of his life dependent upon charity, and this dependence became one of the principles of the Franciscan order. It is a pathetic and beautiful thing that, not knowing what he should now do for his Lord, he noticed that the church of St. Damian, which was his soul's birthplace and his refuge when homeless, was out of repair; and humbly taking hold of the first work that came in view, he set about repairing the edifice with his own hands and with such other help as he could get. This done, he turned to do a similar work at another church nearby, Portiuncula; and there, while attending mass one day, he heard the priest read the tenth chapter of Matthew. It came to him as a message from his Lord, showing him his mission and calling him to it. Now his lifework was found; it was *to be poor and to preach*. "No purse—no scrip—as ye go, preach"—this was the key to his future. His soul had found its burden and its joy.

Francis immediately went to Assisi, up the hill from the church, and preached to the people with power, accepting as before only his necessities from the hands of the charitable. His words and example produced an effect. Soon several other men joined him, and so almost before he knew it, and without previous intention, he was becoming the head of a band of preachers. But they were acting without church authority, only talking from their hearts without clerical ordination, and working together without organization. This was in the spring of 1209. So Francis went to Rome to get permission to found a regular order of preachers within the fold of the church. Innocent III., who was then pope, was opposed to the multiplication of orders, and only reluctantly yielded to the persuasion of Francis and the representations of others, and finally gave consent in 1210 to the establishment of the order, on the conditions that it should be wholly subordinated to the church and under a responsible head. Francis joyfully accepted the conditions, and so his "Little Brothers of the Poor" came into being as an organization of preachers who should live by charity and preach the gospel to the people.

It is not surprising that the saintly zeal of Francis should have impressed women as well as men, and that so there should have arisen alongside of the Brothers the auxiliary order of "Little Sisters of the Poor," devoted to charity and to the aid and encouragement of the preaching brothers. This order came into being under the lead of Clara, the pure and tender-hearted friend of Francis, and was in many ways a help to him and his brethren in their work.

Francis was ordained a deacon, and on his return from Rome set up a sort of convent near Assisi. This was at the church of Santa Maria degli Angeli, otherwise known as Portiuncula. In the great modern church which now occupies the site the original little low-vaulted sanctuary is preserved under the dome, as the central object. An inscription tells that this was the cradle of the Franciscan order. Nearby is preserved—also inside the church—the room in which the saint died. Volunteers came in crowds. Their missionary activity was great. Cloisters were established in various places as headquarters with the rapid

spread of the order in many lands. Preachers went forth during the lifetime of Francis into Syria, Morocco, Hungary, Germany, Spain, France, England. Francis himself went with a crusade to Egypt and afterwards to the East. But as the order grew it developed tendencies which he could not control and were not wholly in harmony with his ideas. A progressive party, under the lead of Brother Elias, of Crotona, was in favor of making more use of education and learning, and these ideas, as we shall see, at last gained the day. Francis and his more intimate associates were in favor of holding by the simpler principles of the first Rule of the order. These troubles within the ranks and the incessant labors of his active life wore upon the founder's mind and strength. He resigned the headship of the order; suffered much from mental anxiety and bodily weakness, but enjoyed abiding peace of soul and joy in God. He died at Portiuncula, in 1226, only forty-four years old.

Of the extant works attributed to Francis¹ a large proportion are certainly spurious, but a number are reckoned by the critics to be as certainly genuine, while others are in dispute. Among the genuine writings are no sermons, properly speaking, but from several of them we may infer something as to the preacher's thought and style. There is a brief but interesting letter to Antony of Padua,² which shows Francis' uneasiness over the coming in of learning as an aid to the preachers, and at the same time illustrates one of his main principles—the insistence upon prayer. Application had been made to admit the brilliant and learned young brother Antony among the authorized preachers of the order, and it is thus that Francis gives his consent:

“To my dearest brother Antony, brother Francis in Christ, greeting. It meets my approval that thou shouldest interpret to the brethren the writings of the Holy Theology; in such way, however, that neither in thee nor in the others (which I vehemently desire) should be ex-

¹ The only edition of the Works of Francis to which I have had access is an old one (1641) by John de la Haye, containing the works of Francis and of Antony of Padua. But the critical studies by Sabatier and by Goetz, referred to in previous note, have of course been regarded in the citations made.

² Ed. of de la Haye, p. 4.

tinguished the spirit of holy prayer, according to the Rule which we profess. Farewell." The *Letter to All Christians* is not certainly genuine, and even if so in the main, has probably been retouched by later hands.² But as it has much in favor of its genuineness we may quote it in illustration of the doctrine and manner of Francis. The opening address is as follows: "Since I am the servant of all, I am bound to serve all and to administer to all the fragrant words of my Lord. Whence considering in mind that I cannot in person, because of the infirmity and weakness of my body, visit each one, I have proposed in the present letter sent forth to offer to you the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Word of the Father, and [also] the words of the Holy Spirit, which are spirit and life." After stating the doctrine concerning Christ, and speaking of his birth, his mission, his institution of the Supper, and his prayer in Gethsemane, he goes on: "Nevertheless he placed his will within the will of the Father, saying, 'Father, thy will be done; not as I will, but as thou wilt.' Of that Father the will was such that his blessed and glorious Son whom he gave for us, and who was born for us, should offer himself, through his own blood, a sacrifice and victim on the altar of the cross, not for himself, by whom all things were made, but for our sins, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps. And he wishes that we all should be saved by him, and should receive him with a pure heart and a chaste body. But there are few who wish to receive him and be saved by him, although his yoke is easy and his burden light." Upon this good gospel foundation, however, he proceeds to erect a superstructure partly of the "gold, silver, precious stones" of divine truth and partly of the "wood, hay, stubble" of traditional error. For example, concerning almsgiving, he says, "Let us therefore have charity and humility and do alms, because these wash our souls from the filth of sins; for men lose all the things which they leave in this world, but carry with them the wages of charity and the alms which they did, for which they shall obtain from the Lord a prize and a worthy reward." And so in other places there is noteworthy mingling of truth and error. But is not this ever true?

² Goetz, *op. cit.*

And must we not remember the times in which this godly man lived and what he was taught and received for truth?

Francis of Assisi was a truly wonderful man. By natural disposition he was gentle, loving, delicate, and these traits had been mellowed by grace into a rare beauty of character. That he had some fanaticism with his devotion, and was (as many others in his days and since) a strange compound of superstition and piety, may be granted. But he was a loving and lovable man. He loved nature, men, and God. The mystical trace in him was combined, as in Bernard and others, with intense desire and active effort for the good of his fellowmen. His preaching was based on his experience, and enforced by his life. It was simple, winsome, tender, persuasive. He preached in the language of the people and to their hearts. He held up Christ as Saviour and Lord. He spoke against pride and every sin, and in favor of all the virtues, exhorting to penitence, faith, humility, chastity, and love. His style was not ornate and learned, but simple, practical, and effective. Sabatier has well summarized one of the secrets of his wonderful power over men in saying, "He was of the people, and the people recognized themselves in him."

While many popular preachers of this age belonged to no order, or to the Dominican or other orders, it is yet not surprising that the two who are most distinguished for power and success in drawing and dealing with great audiences were both Franciscans—Antony of Padua and Berthold of Regensburg.

The little country of Portugal has given birth to at least two of the greatest preachers of the Catholic church: Antony of Padua (c. 1195-1231), and Antonio Vieira, who lived in the seventeenth century. While Padua in Italy was the scene of Antony's principal labors and the resting place of his bones, it was at Lisbon that the famous Franciscan preacher first saw the light, and received his education and start in life. Ferdinand,¹ for this was

¹ De la Haye's ed. of the works of Francis and Antony, before mentioned; article by E. Lempp, in Herzog; and a critical article by the same scholar in Brieger und Bess, *Ztschft. für Kirchengesch.*, Bde. 11, 12, 13.

Antony's baptismal name, was born in Lisbon, of noble or knightly family, and most probably in the year 1195. His parents died while he was young, but the boy was well brought up, and received the current higher education, as his writings abundantly show. He early joined the Augustinian monks while a student at the University of Coimbra. But during this period also occurred the event which decided him to join the followers of Francis. The remains of two Franciscan missionaries who had suffered martyrdom in Morocco were brought to Coimbra for interment. Their fate took hold of the fervid imagination of young Ferdinand and fired him with an ambition to win like them the martyr's crown. This was in 1220. He left the Augustinians, and against the wishes of his friends and amid the jeers of his companions, he became a Franciscan missionary and set out to North Africa in search of martyrdom. He assumed the name of Antony in honor of St. Antony, the renowned old Egyptian monk, leaving his name, his former life, and his native place behind him forever.

In Africa, however, instead of martyrdom at the hands of heathen, he found a sick bed and a long and weary illness from fever. Under this providence he wisely concluded that God desired not so much his death as his life, and embarked for Italy to come in closer touch with his new order, and become perhaps one of its preachers. But his faith and humility were destined to further trials. The vessel in which he sailed was wrecked on the coast of Sicily, but he found brethren of his order and with them attended the General Chapter, which met in 1221 at Assisi. Here he seems to have been unnoticed and neglected, but on his humble request was at last received by one of the elder brethren, who took him with himself to a hermitage in the Campagna. Here he remained for a while learning humility and practising asceticism, till at last he with several others came up for ordination to the priesthood. As they were at the town of Forli for this purpose the prior or leader requested one after another of the younger brethren to preach or lecture to the rest; all declined till brother Antony's turn came; he modestly consented, and discharged the duty in such a way as to reveal to his superiors his wonderful oratorical

talent. Request was made that he should be appointed one of the travelling preachers, and to this, as we have seen, Francis gave his consent.

Brother Antony was now fully launched on his wonderful though short career as a preacher. From now (probably about 1222) to his early death, some ten years later, his labors in preaching were continuous and heavy. Not very much is certainly known of the first years of his work. He preached in Italy and in many places in France, where he had a marvellous effect on the people. His facility in language must have been remarkable, as he seems to have had no difficulty either in France or Italy in making eloquent sermons to the masses. He took part in leading questions and debates of the day and was especially active and successful in restoring heretics to the faith. At last he was made provincial of his order for northeast Italy, and took up his residence in Padua in 1229. But the labors of office too much hindered his preaching, and he was released from the one that he might give his whole attention to the other. But his time was short.

The Franciscans had a residence given to them in Padua, and another just outside the walls called the Little Ark. In these places Antony lived and worked during the two remaining years of his life. Great crowds thronged to hear him—thirty thousand people, it is said—and of course no building could accommodate them. He preached chiefly in the open air and with wonderful power and success. The region near Padua was at that time given over to many sins. He describes it as a "field thirsting for rain;" and he handles its sins with faithfulness and effect. Great was his success; but he was suffering from dropsy and his labors had exhausted his strength. He kept on as long as he could, but finally gave up and took up his residence not very far from Padua in a great tree, in which a little hut was built for him among the branches. Whether his idea in this was hygienic, or superstitious, or merely whimsical, does not appear. But here in his nest he worked at putting his sermons into shape for publication, until at last he was persuaded, when near the end, to come back to the Little Ark at Padua, where he died June 13, 1231, about thirty-eight years old.

There is, as usual, much difference among critics as to the genuine writings of Antony, but amid the many sketches of sermons in Latin which pass under his name, no doubt some are his, and in form and thought at least represent his method; but they do not and cannot convey to us any suggestion of the language, the expression, and still less the power and moving warmth with which he spoke. From among the so-called *Dominical* (Sunday) *Sermons*¹ a specimen or two may serve as illustration of his manner. Thus: Luke 21:25. *There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations.* Here four things are noted according to which there are four advents [of Christ], namely, in the flesh, in the mind, at death, and at the final judgment. I say, first, an advent in the flesh—and that is the assumption of human flesh—is noted here: *There shall be signs in the sun.* For the sun is the Son of God. The second is in the mind, spiritually; and this is the purifying of our mind, either a protection against sin, or a conferring of virtues, in this: *In the moon.* The third in death, which is the separation of body and soul, in this: *In the stars.* For the stars will fall from heaven, etc. The fourth in the end of all things (*ultimo fine*), in which there will be apportionment of merits and punishment of wrongs, in this: *And in the earth distress of nations, etc.* On this basis he proceeds to enlarge his points with all sorts of plays upon words, allegorical extravagances and the like.

In another sermon he discusses the message of John the Baptist from the prison, and founds his treatment upon the signification of the persons involved. Thus: Herod represents the world; Herodias the flesh; John in chains the spirit of man in bondage to pleasure; and the two disciples of John stand for hope and fear. But it is really unfair to judge Antony by such imperfect specimens of the mere outlines of his sermons, and those not certainly genuine.

The traditions of his preaching contain much of the marvellous, both as to the astonishing crowds it drew and as to the effects produced by it. But making due allowance for extravagance in these stories, and for later

¹ Ed. of de la Haye.

additions to them, there is sober basis in fact for Antony's great reputation. In his use of Scripture he followed to the most absurd extreme the fanciful allegorical method; but in his division he used sensibly and well, without undue detail, the theological analysis of the scholastics, and did a service to preaching in popularizing a better structure of discourse than that of the homily. In his numerous and telling illustrations he drew freshly and powerfully from the everyday life about him, from nature, from human nature; in earnestness, fervor, and effect his strength is unquestioned; and in drawing power he has never been surpassed, rivalled only by his fellow Franciscan Berthold, later in the century, and by Whitefield, perhaps Moody, and a few others, in modern times.

One of the most remarkable preachers of that age, or indeed of any age, was the Franciscan evangelist Berthold (c. 1220-1272), of Regensburg (Ratisbon), in Bavaria.¹ Not much is known of his life, which, except for his wonderful preaching, was probably uneventful. The man is known almost solely in his work. He was born probably at or near Regensburg in the first quarter of the thirteenth century, most likely not earlier than 1220 nor later than 1225. Nothing is known of his family or family name. He is simply known as "Brother Berthold," in the various forms in which the name is given. At an early age he was taken into the Franciscan abbey at Regensburg, and there educated. Henceforth his name is always associated with this place, which was his home or headquarters during life and his resting-place at death. Here he fell under the tutelage of the pious and devoted mystic, David of Augsburg, who long taught at Regensburg, and was himself a preacher of no mean abilities.² The friendship and encouragement of this good man had much to do with Berthold's after success. It is

¹ All the German historians of preaching in the Middle Ages, both Catholic and Protestant, and with pardonable pride, pay much attention to Berthold. There are good discussions in the works of Linsenmayer, Cruel, Albert, Nebe; and an account by Göbel prefixed to his valuable translation of the sermons of Berthold into modern German. Editions in the old dialect have also appeared, and there are copious extracts in some of the writers above named and in the lively sketch of C. W. Stromberger, *Berthold von Regensburg*.

² See below, p. 281.

related that during his preaching Brother David would sometimes accompany him, help him with suggestion and cheer, and sometimes sit behind him and encourage him as he preached. Sweet, indeed, is it for the loneliness of genius to be cheered by the intelligent sympathy of a real friend!

Berthold's sermons show acquaintance with the church fathers and other theological literature, but no high degree of learning, nor any marked depth or subtlety of thought. He could not be called either scholastic or mystic, but distinctively a powerful popular preacher in whom the clear arrangement of scholasticism and the warm piety of mysticism showed traces but not ascendancy. In his convent sermons he used Latin, and in his other sermons shows familiar and easy acquaintance with that tongue, but his great work was done in the rude old German of his time.

The first mention of Brother Berthold is in 1246, when he was sent to one of the nunneries of his order to lecture and preach. About 1250 he appears as a travelling preacher, creating unwonted enthusiasm, attracting great multitudes which no church could hold, overflowing sometimes even the squares of the towns. He preached on the hillsides from a lofty wooden tower, and it is said even from trees, where a sort of scaffolding would be erected for him. He must have had a very powerful or very penetrating voice, and would take the direction of the wind with a feather and speak "down the wind." During ten years he went through Bavaria, Suabia, Alsace, Switzerland, stopping longer in some places than in others, and sometimes repeating his visits. About 1260 he turned toward eastern Germany and traversed Austria, Bohemia, Hungary, taking in Franconia and Thuringia on the return trip. In some of these lands he could not speak the language and preached by an interpreter. These are the scanty details of a life filled with incessant activity and phenomenal success in preaching the word of God to the people during a trying and fearful time in Germany.

It will be remembered that the years of Berthold's ministry (1250-1272) coincided almost exactly with the period known in German history as the Great Interreg-

num, when for about twenty years after the fall of the Hohenstaufen emperors there was no king in Germany, and the reins of authority were loosed. Petty sovereigns and lords were without an overlord, and the political, social, and moral disorders of the times were great. In such a time as this the voice of this man came as that of a prophet of old, sent of God to rebuke the wicked and comfort those who waited for better days. In 1272 Berthold died and was buried at Regensburg, where his tomb was long regarded and visited as that of a saint, and his memory held in grateful affection by the people.

There remain some of his Latin sermons, probably only sketches, chiefly of his convent sermons, and perhaps written by himself. These would be valuable if we had nothing else, but fortunately in his case a number—some seventy or eighty—of his German sermons have been preserved in the reports of hearers. Early in the nineteenth century one of the brothers Grimm called the attention of scholars and literary men to these manuscript sermons as choice specimens of early German prose. Since then they have been published in various partial or complete editions, and a Catholic scholar. Göbel, has done good service by turning them into modern German. The sermons are now therefore accessible to those acquainted with the German of to-day, and will repay study.

From these and the traditional accounts we see that Berthold was, above all things, a mighty preacher to the people. He had true piety, conviction, and a sincere desire to save and teach men. He preached not for his own fame or reward, but for the glory of his Lord and the help of his fellowmen. Repentance was his principal theme. Like another John the Baptist he thundered against sin, and called the people to conversion. He powerfully and unflinchingly attacked the sins of all classes. He told the lords plainly that they were like rapacious eagles preying upon the sheep, he rated in no soft tones the judges who rendered unjust decisions for hire, he satirized and denounced the sinful follies of polite society and the baser vices of all orders, he paid special attention to the false and worldly clergy, and before Luther was dreamed of denounced the "penny preachers" who

traded in spiritual things; he scored the cheats and fakirs, the dicers and dancers, the lazy, the gluttonous—in fact, sinners of every hue. But his special pet object of attack was the avaricious man, the “geiziger,” who stands out with unenviable distinctness in his vivid pictures. Like Antony and other moral preachers of the time he condemned usury with reiterated emphasis. Heresy, too, claimed his attention and he faithfully warned against what he believed to be errors. On the other hand he painted in glowing colors the beauty of the Christian virtues and the present and eternal rewards of the Christian life. Nor was it a mere external morality that he preached; he showed the worthlessness of works without faith, even if he did lay too much merit to the works of faith. He exalted Christ as the only Saviour from an eternal and agonizing hell, the only Guide to the lasting and blessed kingdom of God. Of course, with all this, the characteristic doctrinal and other errors and perversions common to his age fully appear. It was no pure Scriptural gospel that he preached, but mediæval Romanism, yet at its best. He was wonderfully gifted in the art of fresh, vivid, moving popular address. Invective, warning, appeal, exhortation, all were at his command. Imagery and illustration abounded, often homely, sometimes coarse. Vivid dialogues and shrewd hits enlivened discourse; but through all these rhetorical devices shines full and clear the lofty purpose of the speaker to quicken and guide the spiritual life of his hearers. The following outline of one of his most characteristic sermons will give at least a hint of his manner:

On Seven Very Great Sins.

Text (misquoted, and no book and chapter given, probably intended for John 15:11): “I rejoice in thee, and my joy is perfected in thee.” Three kinds of people make God glad—each gladder than the other in succession; namely, those who keep from mortal sins, those who are habitually good, and those who die in the practice of goodness. Correspondingly, three kinds of people make the devil glad; namely, those who occasionally fall into sin, those who live in sin, and those who die in sin. But seven kinds of people not only make the devil glad but put a crown on him (see Rev.

12:3). The seven crowns of the dragon are the seven chief sins, and they bring people to the bottom of hell just as the seven princes of Egypt went to the bottom of the Red Sea. Here they are: 1. Those who are damned for the multitude of their sins. 2. Those for the greatness of their sins—such as perjurers, adulterers, excommunicates, etc. 3. The devil's hunters (male and female), such as harlots, procurers, and the penny preachers. 4. Heretics. 5. [Left blank. The editor supposes it was the unpardonable sin, about which Berthold elsewhere manifests unwillingness to speak plainly.] 6. Bad masters and unjust judges. 7. The avaricious. In "enlarging on his points" he does not mince matters at all, but strikes out right and left without fear or favor.

Besides the great men who have been discussed there were a number of less distinguished preachers to the people who worked in the spirit and methods of the leaders. The names of some have come down to us, and there are besides numerous anonymous sermons which have been preserved from that age, and exhibit the popular character.¹

Among the French preachers may be named Stephen (Étienne) of Bourbon (d. 1261), who preached much, travelled much, and came in contact with many persons of distinction, secular and religious. He wrote a book for preachers containing extracts and examples of sermons, and divided into seven parts representing the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. There was also William of Auvergne, who was bishop of Paris from 1228 to his death in 1249, and was very influential in church and state. He had popular gifts as a preacher, and excelled, sometimes exceeded, in the use of figures and illustrations.

Of the Germans, besides David of Augsburg, who will be noticed among the mystics, there was a Cæsarius of Heisterbach (d. c. 1240), whose sermons show good skill in construction, variety, and power of oratory. There were also a certain Peregrinus, from whom we have a collection of sketches; and an anonymous preacher in the neighborhood of Black Forest, whose lively and vigor-

¹ For the French and German preachers, the authorities so often cited; and for those of Italy, Zanotto, *Storia della Predicazione*.

ous sermons show alike the influence of Berthold and of Jacob of Voragine. But perhaps the most interesting of these Germans was Conrad of Brundelsheim (d. 1321), who was abbot of the Cistercian monastery at Heilsbronn. A collection of his sermons, or sketches, in Latin, bears the curious title of *Sermones Fratris Socci*, i.e., "The Sermons of Brother Sock." Why he was called "Sock" does not appear. One humorous suggestion, mentioned by Linsenmayer, is to the effect that perhaps he carried his notes in his ample socks; but Cruel offers the more rational guess that it was a nickname given him from some personal habit or occurrence and had nothing to do with his preaching. At any rate, "Brother Sock" gave to his brethren in these rather scholastic Latin sketches a set of sermons to modify and use which show that he was himself no mean preacher to the people; and there is no doubt that his brethren made abundant use of his liberality and often turned them to account.

There was among the Italians a well-known preacher called John of Vicenza (Giovanni da Vicenza, or da Schio), who was renowned as a peacemaker in many parts of Italy, and by whose eloquent persuasions foes and feuds were reconciled. But more important for us than he was Jacob de Voragine (1230-1298), who was a Dominican, and probably had experience in early life as a travelling preacher, but was, when he died, a prelate at Genoa. He thus represents both the parochial and the popular preaching of the time. Not much is known of him, but the traditional accounts represent him as a greatly beloved and admired preacher to the people. His interest for us lies chiefly in the fact that he was the compiler of the stories of the saints in the collection called *Legenda Aurea*, commonly known to us in the singular number as the "Golden Legend." There were, of course, later editions of this book, and it is not possible to determine how much of the work is due to his editorial care and was worked over by him. In the collection are many sermons, mostly on the saints and the Virgin Mary. Christlieb¹ says the book gives us "a deep insight into the etymological fooleries (interpreting allegorically the names of Biblical characters, etc.), the crass superstitions

¹ Art. in Herzog, Bd. 18, supplement.

and the incredibly tasteless love of miracles of that age. Also its numerous sermons show not only the unfruitfulness for real edification of scholastic pedantic trifling and legendary picturing, but they helped much to corrupt taste in preaching." But the sermons are given in a warm, even fiery manner, and are often lively and picturesque in style and imagery, and so very well suited to popular use. Longfellow's *Golden Legend* gives many a hint as to the contents of the book, though by him the best parts were selected, hung on the thread of a pleasing story, and softened and beautified by the spirit of poetry and the gentle sentiment of our poet of the fireside.

CHAPTER VIII

DECLINE AND MYSTICISM IN THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES

In the present chapter we have to do with the latter part of the thirteenth and a little more than the first half of the fourteenth century, that is, as far as the death of John Tauler, the great mystic preacher, in 1361.

Europe was a troubled world in the fourteenth century. The Hundred Years' War between England and France was begun by Edward III. of England early in the century, and was taxing the strength and resources of both nations. Germany was in awful confusion with a disputed imperial succession between Louis of Bavaria and Frederick of Austria; division, civil wars, and other trials desolated the land. Conditions in Italy were no better than formerly—endless squabbles and no hope of unity and strength. After the conflict of Boniface VIII. with Philip the Fair the papacy became a tool of France, and for seventy years (1309-1378) the residence of the popes was at Avignon in southern France, instead of at Rome. Corruption accompanied decay. The papal court by its luxury and turpitude was a stench in the nostrils of mankind, and there seemed no remedy for the desperate case. In such a time preaching fared but ill. We have to note a sad decline in the scholastic and popular types of preaching, but at the same time to describe the growth and power of the mystic type which stamps a somewhat redeeming character of its own upon the age.

I. DECLINE OF SCHOLASTIC AND POPULAR PREACHING

The great preachers of the Dominican and Franciscan orders had passed away, and the day of the second-rate man had come. Albert and Thomas, Antony and Berthold are memories and models, but no longer living forces. Along with this, popular interest in preaching and popular regard for the preacher sensibly diminished. We do not now hear of so great crowds and so great effects. Furthermore, the quality of sermons which have come down to us from the scholastic and popular preachers after Aquinas and Berthold gives abundant evidence of a falling off in power.

In undertaking to discover and state the causes of this decay we have to fall back upon that mysterious law of reaction which we have so frequent occasion to observe and apply. The two great movements in preaching to which the names scholastic and popular have been given had reached their height and must recede. At high tide there is strength, repose, beauty; but when the waters recede they leave trash and slime behind them to augment the ugly and unclean things which they had covered but not washed away. So the inherent, inevitable, faults and weaknesses which are connected with every great forward movement—whether in the movement itself, as in the wave, or fixed in habit and custom, as on the shore—appear in all their ugliness when the reaction comes. In the scholastic sermons, the over-speculation, the hair-splitting distinctions, the tedious detail of analysis, the frequent sophistries and useless conclusions were at all times ugly faults; but now that the vigor of youth and the freshness of genius were departed this manner of preaching became barren indeed. And still worse was it that the religious spirit which had counteracted and even utilized so much that was weak in scholasticism had itself lost intensity and fervor. In popular preaching, the seeking after effect, the misuse of Scripture, the coarse humor, that could hardly be tolerated even when accompanied by real devotion and spiritual power, became now in their emptiness almost a hideous mockery of preaching. Further, as to both these modes of preaching, we see what is well exemplified in many other spheres, namely,

that methods which are rods of power in the hands of masters are rotten reeds in those of feeble imitators. Little Thomases and little Bertholds multiplied, and made odious the things which had done good service in a former generation.

And in addition to these inward causes of decay the standing external hindrances were to be reckoned with. The world, the flesh, and the devil, always and everywhere, are leagued in lively coöperation against good gospel preaching; and these evil allies were as present and as potent in the times which we are discussing as they are in our own. Corruption in society and church, in laity and clergy, was bad enough and getting worse. And, finally, we must notice that growth of power, popularity, and even earthly possessions, had corrupted and weakened the spiritual and fruitful work of the two great preaching orders. Except for the mystics among the Dominicans we have to record a falling off in character, and therefore in the best influence, for both the orders of preachers. Yet we must not think that the decay was total or even more rapid than it really was. History is not best written in antitheses. We may err to distortion by emphasizing contrast. In human affairs evil and good are always present, sometimes one is more evident, sometimes the other.

In order to preserve the continuity of our narrative there is needed a brief mention of some of the more important preachers of the scholastic and popular tendencies during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. But only a few of the best from the different countries need be named.

In Italy there was a certain Jordan (Giordano) of Pisa, or Rivalto (d. 1311), who is mentioned favorably by Italian writers as a preacher of power in the popular tongue, who was also distinguished both for his piety and his scholarship. He was learned in the languages, and his knowledge of the Scriptures is praised as remarkable.

In Germany there are several preachers worthy of being remembered. One was Nicholas of Landau, who was quite a scholastic, pushing the method of that school to considerable extremes. Another was Henry of

Frimar (d. 1340), who taught in Paris for a while, and then in Prague. From him a number of very scholastic sermons remain. Like him was Jordan of Quedlinburg, who enjoyed a good reputation in his day and left behind him a number of sermons in Latin, which are marked like the others by excess of scholasticism.

In France there were a number of preachers, but none very distinguished in comparison with those of earlier and later times. Famous as a scholar and commentator, though not especially for his preaching, was Nicholas of Lyra (d. 1340), a Franciscan, and teacher at Paris and other places. His commentary on the whole Bible had the name of "postils," or brief homilies, and suggests that a good deal of it was used in preaching. Besides there are some sermons remaining. But Lyra's chief distinction is that in interpreting the Bible he somewhat broke away from the traditional and absurd allegorical method and did something toward bringing in a sounder exegesis of Scripture. Besides, there were two distinguished prelates and canonists (interpreters of canon, i.e., ecclesiastical as distinguished from civil, law) who bore the name of William Durand, the elder the uncle (d. 1296), and the younger (d. 1328), from whom some sermons and a good name remain.

England was not fertile of strong preachers during any part of this period. She was waiting for Wiclif and the Reformation. But of course there were preaching and preachers in England all this while, and two distinguished prelates who belonged to the Dominican order may be named as lights of the period. These were William of Macclesfield, and Walter of Winterbourne (d. 1305). The latter was in the evening of his life a learned canonist and cardinal, and of his earlier days Fuller¹ says, "in his youth he was a good poet and an orator." From this we may perhaps sadly infer that learning and law and office had dried up the springs of his fancy and had left him less effective in speech during his later years. At any rate such and such things have been known to happen to Englishmen—and to others. From this declining scholasticism let us turn to the rising power of mystic preaching.

¹ Quoted in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, article on Walter of Winterbourne.

2. RISE AND POWER OF MYSTIC PREACHING

Mysticism¹ has appeared in many ages and nations, in philosophy and life, as well as in theology and religion and preaching. It has also more or less affected the preaching of every age; but as some of the most notable preachers of the period we have under notice were mystics, this is perhaps the best place to give to mysticism such brief consideration as our space permits, before discussing its leading representatives in the pulpit of the time.

When we ask what is mysticism? the very associations of the word suggest the extreme difficulty of definition. Like all terms used to describe mental phenomena and tendencies of thought, which have large general import and many shades of particular application, mysticism is hard to define. That is, it is difficult to frame a statement general enough to include all that is meant by the term and brief enough to be put into a sentence and easily remembered. But brief descriptive statements of the essential character of mysticism may be made sufficiently exact to give a good working knowledge of it in lack of accurate scientific definition. Thus Vaughan² says: "Philosophers and monks alike employ the word mysticism and its cognate terms as involving the idea not merely of initiation into something hidden,³ but beyond this of an internal manifestation of the Divine to the intuition, or in the feeling, of the secluded soul." Clarke,⁴ greatly influenced by Vaughan, puts the matter rather more simply thus: "The belief that man can come into union with the Infinite Being by means of a wholly passive self surrender to divine influence." And Preger⁵ has it: "The characteristic of mysticism is

¹ For Mysticism I have derived most help from the following works: R. Vaughan's *Hours with the Mystics*; Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy*; James Freeman Clarke's *Events and Epochs in Religious History*; Preger's *Geschichte der Deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter*. The authorities on the history of preaching for the period also give much that is helpful.

² *Hours with the Mystics*, p. 21.

³ The etymological meaning of the word.

⁴ *Events and Epochs of Rel. Hist.*, p. 276.

⁵ *Geschichte der Mystik*, Bd. I., S. 8. "Das Characteristische der Mystik ist, dass sie ein unmittelbares Erleben und Schauen des Göttlichen anstrebt."

that it strives after an immediate experience and vision of the Divine." In mysticism three forms, more or less allied to each other, are to be distinguished. Vaughan calls them "theopathic, theosophic, and theurgic;" and Clarke, "religious, philosophic, and thaumaturgic." More simply, these distinctions, which cannot be exact, indicate that the central position of mysticism has three ways of expressing itself: (1) an immediate intuition of truth—philosophic or speculative mysticism; (2) an immediate dealing of the soul with God—religious mysticism; (3) by virtue of these, the ability to perform miraculous or at least extraordinary works—wonder-working mysticism. The philosophic or speculative mystic sees truth not by logical processes but by direct vision, in some ecstasy of high and intense thinking; the religious mystic knows and realizes God not by investigation and reasoning, and not by external means of any sort, but by rapt contemplation, by complete surrender of self to divine influence; the wonder-working mystic claims, by virtue of this supernatural indwelling of truth or of God, the power to exert extraordinary influences upon the minds and even the bodies of others. The last phase has perhaps fewer representatives, and is more commonly regarded as extreme, fanatical, and vulgar; but in its less extreme and objectionable forms is allied sometimes to the philosophic but more naturally and commonly to the religious sort of mysticism. The philosophic and religious types easily pass into each other; what particular form mysticism takes simply depends on whether the mystic is himself rather a philosopher or a religionist. Thus Fichte and Emerson are philosophic mystics; Tauler and George Fox religious ones; while in Eckhart and Behmen the two strains are fused. Let us repeat then, that in religious mysticism the essential thing is the avowed consciousness of an immediate dealing of the soul with God; a surrender of self, a possession by God; a complete union with God, or fullness of God.

What has been said shows how perilous it is either to deny wholly or to accept without qualification the central position of mysticism. That it contains truth is just as clear as that it is not all or solely truth. To deny

it wholly is to blind the soul to one of its highest privileges, to accept it solely is to fall into fatal error. For in some phase or degree mysticism may be connected with the holiest piety, or with the grossest sins; with the best and most fruitful religious activities, or with the idlest and most insane speculations; with enduring and beneficent labors and services in the kingdom of God, or with lasting injuries to the cause of true religion; with reverent acceptance of the Bible as authoritative revelation from God, or with a qualified acceptance of it admitting of correction by the inner light, or even at last to utter rejection of it as a divine message, and the substitution of the vagaries of an unbalanced mind.

The errors and exaggerations of the mystical tendency in the religious life may well make us wary of its one-sided and extreme phases, but the element of truth in it keeps it alive. Both those who hail its extremes as new truth and those who dread them as new error need the historic perspective. For in all centuries Christianity in general, and preaching in particular, have profited by the good and suffered by the evil of mysticism.

It may be a question whether mysticism has had its chief seat of power in the cloister, the school, or the pulpit; but it unquestionably powerfully influenced the last through the other two.

The mystical yearning both led to the cloister and was strengthened and encouraged there. The contemplative life, the study of Scripture, the prayers and other influences of convent life were favorable to its development. Hence we are not surprised to find that most of the mystic preaching was given in the monasteries, and that most of the mystical preachers were trained in them. From early times the monastic life had thus laid its moulding hand on the pulpit, and the powerful impulse given to monasticism by Bernard in the twelfth century and by Francis and Dominic in the thirteenth, and the high place held by all three of these men in the pulpit, had great effect in enlarging the influence of monastic mysticism upon the preaching of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Nor must the influence of the other monastic orders be forgotten. Benedictines, Au-

gustinians, Præmonstrants, and others had something to do with the extension of mysticism.

And here we must notice another important and helpful force in developing and spreading mystical views, that is, the nunneries, and the pious women both within and without these institutions. Mysticism has large affinities with the feminine nature, and it is not at all surprising to find that some of its most distinguished representatives and teachers in all its phases and during all its history have been women. It does not fall within the scope of this treatise to discuss this interesting phase of the subject at any length. But Preger¹ has shown that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries along the Rhine and in the Netherlands—not to speak of other localities—in the cloisters and out of them numbers of mystical women lived and worked. Hildegard of Bingen, Elizabeth of Schönau; the Beguines, Mary of Oigny, Matilda of Magdeburg; the nun Gertrude, and others are mentioned as influential in one way and another in promoting the spread of mysticism. Ecstasies and prophecies, nervous faints, excess of feeling, profuse weeping and various other such phenomena, were frequent characteristics of the feminine religious life of the period. All this prepared the audiences to listen with sympathy and appreciation to the sermons of the mystic preachers. In fact, many of the sermons of this tendency, both Eckhart's and Tauler's, were actually preached in the nunneries, and we owe their preservation to the insight, sympathy, and skill of the pious women who reported and wrote them out.

In the schools as well as the cloisters mysticism had a place of power from which it greatly and permanently influenced the pulpit. Many of these schools were cloister schools, and the most distinguished teachers were members of some one of the orders. It is scarcely a distinction therefore to separate the school from the cloister, except that it gives us occasion to note the specifically scholastic and speculative bent which was given to the mystic trend of thought in the hands of professors. Among these the names of Hugo and Richard come up for mention again, as these distinguished lecturers ex-

¹ *Op. cit.*, SS. 13-141.

pounded their systems at the abbey of St. Victor at Paris in the twelfth century. In the thirteenth the renowned teacher, Albert the Great, at Cologne and Paris, paid much attention to the mystic element in religious thought, and through his widespread influence many preachers of the Dominican order became devoted to this way of thinking. The greatest of the scholastics, Thomas Aquinas, also incidentally gave some teaching in this direction. In life, and probably in preaching, the mystic element was more decided than in his rigorously logical theological system; but even there it was not wholly wanting, though not emphasized or largely developed.

After the mystics of the twelfth century we do not find any distinctly great preacher of this tendency until we come to Bonaventura in the thirteenth; but all along there were those whose preaching kept up the continuity of mystic thought. There was lull but no cessation of mystic preaching between Richard of St. Victor and Bonaventura. With the latter, however, there is a revival of mysticism under the scholastic guidance, and after him the work of Master Eckhart gave the start to the developments which followed and reached their height in those who were taught or influenced by that powerful teacher.

Nor was it only in the preachers of the church and its orders that mysticism was found. There were various heretical sects among whom the teachings flourished, and these were represented by preachers as well as writers whose influence among the people was considerable.¹ Of these, Amalric of Bena, early in the thirteenth century was largely influenced by Joachim of Floris, and had in France a rather large following. Later, a certain David of Dinant is mentioned as a teacher of influence, and a sort of society known as "Brothers of the Free Spirit" became very notable in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Thus in many ways and from many sources, mystic teaching impresses itself upon the preaching of the time, and becomes, though not to the exclusion of other tendencies, the characteristic feature of the pulpit of the period.

It is important at this point to consider how widely

¹ See Preger, Buch II., Kap. II., for full discussion.

extended this mystic preaching was, and what was in a general way its character.¹

In regard to extent it should be observed that the range of the really powerful mystic preaching was comparatively limited. The locality of it was chiefly along the Rhine, on both sides, and in the Netherlands. Of course it was not confined to this region, but here it was more in evidence and reached its greatest influence. As to following, too, it is from the nature of the case clear that mystic preaching can never be so widely and influentially popular as that which is less distinctively marked by the peculiar tenets of mysticism. Partly the lofty religious life which it requires in its better forms, partly the fanatical or at least overwrought phases of it in its less balanced forms, and partly the difficulty of comprehending it in all its forms, make mysticism always the profession of the few, rather than of the many. In comparison then with the mighty scholastic and popular preachers of the age the mystics had smaller audiences, more select, most usually those already Christian, and a far less extensive range of influence.

The particular teachings of the different mystic preachers can be better exhibited in discussing the men themselves, but before that a remark on the general character of mystic preaching is requisite. Its one distinctive common trait was the doctrine of a union of the soul with God. This was the goal of all mystic preaching. The steps by which this fusion of the divine and human were to be attained might be differently described and named, the very nature of the things in question might be differently stated, and the results of the union differently set forth, but this one great idea of immediate intercourse of the Christian soul with God underlies all the mystic preaching. It was this noble aim which gave and still gives to mystic teaching its power; and if this general statement were all, it might well be left unchallenged. But when we come to details we see how in enforcing its greatest thought the mystic preaching became im-

¹ Besides the books on Mysticism in general, those of Linsenmayer, Cruel, and Albert discuss its particular relation to preaching—Linsenmayer of course from the Catholic point of view. The Protestant writers, including Preger, find in this mystic preaching an important preparation for the Reformation.

perilled and fell into grievous errors. For example, the doctrine of the relation between God and man in the hands of Eckhart and his followers came so near to pantheism that the students of his system, then and still, have been divided in opinion as to whether it was or was not really pantheistic teaching. Again, the emphasis upon personal experience and individual dealing directly with God led (and still leads) to undervaluing of the Bible as the one authoritative revelation of the mind and will of God in regard to salvation; and naturally this led to erroneous treatment of many of the most important doctrines of the Scripture, especially those relating to sin and redemption. Again, a peril of the mystic preaching which was not always successfully avoided lay in such insistence upon passivity, as the condition of the mystic union with God as to end in sloth. Not in Bernard, nor in Tauler, nor in those like them, do we find this mistake; but in others there are traces of laying stress upon the contemplative life to the injury of the active.

The differences which prevailed among the mystics themselves in regard to the details of their general system have already been foreshadowed and lead to a clear though not sharply defined classification. Those who adhered to the church theology and the scholastic method, like the Victorines, Albert and Bonaventura, are properly called scholastic mystics. Those who followed the powerful lead of Eckhart in using the church doctrines and the Bible itself only as starting points for profound speculations, growing chiefly out of personal experience, are rightly named speculative mystics. And those who, like Bernard, Francis, and Tauler, combined, both in theory and life, lofty mystical aspirations with active earnest work for the souls of men, are suitably described as practical mystics. But to get a more definite and concrete view of the mystic preaching of the period we must consider it as set forth in the lives and works of its representative men.

3. LEADING PREACHERS OF THE MYSTIC SCHOOL

Following the grouping just indicated we notice first those who were more distinctly influenced by scholastic training and modes of thought.

We have seen that in Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, and later in Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas, there was a mingling of mysticism and scholasticism, with this difference: that in the first two the mystic element predominated over the scholastic, while in the other two, the scholastic was supreme, the mystic incidental. But there was one great preacher of the age of whom it has been said that he was "the greatest scholastic among the mystics and the greatest mystic among the scholastics." This was none other than John Fidanza, better known by his acquired and canonized name of Bonaventura (1221-1274).¹ The future "doctor seraphicus," scholastic, mystic, cardinal and saint, was born at Bagnorea in Tuscany in the year 1221. His parents were respectable people, though not distinguished. The boy received his father's name of John, but his famous nickname, as he himself relates, came to him in the following fashion: When he was three years old he fell ill, and his pious mother sought in his behalf the prayers of the saintly Francis of Assisi, who was at that time in the neighborhood. After the child's recovery he was shown by the grateful woman to the holy man, who exclaimed: "*O buona ventura*," which may be familiarly rendered, "O good luck." Henceforth, as in other instances, the nickname has usurped the place of the baptismal one, and history knows the child of St. Francis' answered prayers as Bonaventura.

The boy grew up pure and pious, and, as was natural, early entered the Franciscan order. He loved learning as well as religion, and made excellent progress in his studies. He was sent to Paris and studied under the renowned English scholastic, the "irrefragable doctor," Alexander Hales, who is said to have remarked concerning his pupil, "In Brother Bonaventura Adam seems not to have sinned." Here at the University of Paris he met the promising young Dominican, his fellow countryman, Thomas of Aquino, and the two, though of different orders, formed a lasting and beautiful friendship. Their lives were remarkably parallel. Both became distin-

¹ Besides the authorities already named, *Acta Sanctorum*, July, Vol. III., p. 770 ss; Guillon's *Bibliothèque des Pères de l'Église*, tom. 25; Cardinal Fanna's *Ratio Novæ Collectionis Op. S. Bonaventuræ*—a critical discussion, not an edition of his works.

guished scholars and theologians, they took the doctor's degree the same day, they died the same year, Aquinas in March, Bonaventura in July, 1274; Aquinas on the way to, and Bonaventura at, the Council of Lyons.

Bonaventura was at an early age made general of his order, and filled various church offices with success and distinction. It is said that he was once offered the archbishopric of York, but declined. He was honored as a friend by the pious king Louis IX. of France, hailed by admiring pupils as the "seraphic doctor," and not long before his death was made a cardinal.

Numerous writings of Bonaventura remain, among them very many sketches of sermons. The critics, of course, reject some of these, but enough of them may be accepted as genuine¹ to give such a basis of judgment as we have in other cases. No preacher, as we have often to observe, can be fairly judged by the mere notes and outlines of his sermons, and yet they give some notion of his methods and ideas. From the other works of Bonaventura, however, we may gather his opinions on theology, and infer something as to his manner of preaching. The scholastic method and the mystic spirit are clearly seen. He developed the mystic teachings of Bernard and the Victorines. Like Richard, he held to six stages in the ascent of the soul to the perfection of union with God, but he tried to improve on Richard by further distinctions and different statements. In some of his writings he represents three stages in the Christian life: (1) Fulfilling the requirements of the law; (2) Following the spiritual teachings of the gospel; (3) Attaining to blessedness by the six steps of contemplation. It would take us too far afield to go minutely into these subtleties. His general position is summed up by Vaughan² thus: "Bonaventura resolves all science into union with God. The successive attainment of various kinds of knowledge is in his system an approximation, stage by stage, to God—a scaling of the heights of illumination, as we are more closely united with the divine Word, the repertory of ideas." He is thus rather Platonic than Aristotelian.³ The Christian elements of

¹ See Fanna, *Ratio Novæ Collect.*, etc.

² *Hours with the Mystics*, p. 149 f.

³ Cf. Ueberweg, *Hist. Philos.*, pp. 433, 453 f.; and Preger, Bd. I., S. 251 ff.

his system appear in many ways; for example, the ultimate goal, the sixth stage in contemplation of the divine, is the loving and reverential apprehension of the being of God as revealed in the blessed Trinity. In speaking of the corresponding powers by which man makes the steps necessary to reach the goal of union with God, he says,¹ "But these powers are corrupted by sin; they must be restored by grace, purified by righteousness, exercised by knowledge and perfected by wisdom. Christ both is and works this fourfold help, which may be also described as twofold: grace and truth."

Leaving Bonaventura's mysticism to the theologian and philosopher we come to his preaching. The contemporary accounts of his eloquence are numerous and decisive. He is praised both as *sermocinator ad clerum et prædicator ad populum*—sermonizer to the clergy and preacher to the people. He was fluent, ardent, persuasive. The outlines of his sermons are bare, and they illustrate the scholastic and allegorical methods of his time. One example will be enough to show his manner. The text is Isa. 52:13, "Behold my servant shall deal prudently (Lat. *intelligent*, shall understand); he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high." He takes the text as a prophecy and commendation, not of Christ, but arbitrarily of John the Evangelist. The outline is as follows: John is here commended: 1. For the holiness of an excellent life, in the words, "My servant." 2. For the clearness of his knowledge—"Shall understand." 3. For the excellency of his doctrine—"Shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high." Now on the basis of his threefold intelligence he was raised to a threefold dignity: 1. Apostolic rank, because he knew useful things; 2. Prophecy, because he knew hidden things; 3. Gospel teaching (evangelist), because he knew high things. Hence he has left us three sets of works: 1. The Epistles, as a preacher; 2. The Apocalypse, as a prophet; 3. The Gospel, as a scribe.

So much for the scholastic; the mystic is revealed in the following quotation² from a sermon on the Passion of our Lord: "O death, O passion of my Saviour,

¹ Preger, *op. cit.*, S. 254.

² Guillon, *Bibl. des Pères*, tom. 25, p. 83.

source of all good things. Here it is death that gives life, it is wounds that heal; the blood bathes and purifies; the opening of the side unites hearts. O wonderful death which makes all my joy, all my happiness, which crowns all my wishes! No; I will no longer be separated from my Jesus; there is no felicity but in being with him. I will prepare myself three retreats; one in the wounds of his hands, another in that of his feet, the third (Ah! this will be the one where I shall fix my abode) will be in his side. There I will speak to his heart; there I shall obtain the accomplishment of all my desires. So, more and more, will I imitate his most holy mother, whose soul was torn by the sword of the passion of her Son. O wounds of Jesus my Saviour! O dwelling full of charms! With what delights, think you, should be flooded the soul which by these sacred doors enters into the heart of Jesus Christ? which attaches, closely unites itself, unchangeably, to that divine heart? Nay; I cannot express it! Make you trial of it! That is the only means of knowing it!"

The older school of churchly scholastic mysticism, adhering stanchly to the Catholic traditional orthodoxy, and developing its views in the dialectic method of the schools, reached its height and its end in Bonaventura. Toward the end of the thirteenth century we find a powerful mind, a thinker of a new order, who is less careful of dialectic distinction and logical form and minute analysis, and is less concerned to use these in order to harmonize his views either with the established dogmas of the church or with the real meaning of the Scriptures. The experience of the individual soul in its dealing with God comes to the fore as a source and criterion of truth and knowledge, and henceforth we have to deal with a new tendency in the philosophy and theology of Europe. This tendency is represented in those whom we have called speculative mystics.

The leader of these was the celebrated Master Eckhart (c. 1260-c. 1327).¹ What is known and inferred as to his life can be told in few words. There is some uncertainty as to the exact dates of his birth and death,

¹ For studies of Eckhart see Vaughan, Preger and the historians of German preaching before cited.

but it is inferred that he was born about 1260. He was a native of Thuringia in the neighborhood of Strasburg. He early joined the Dominicans and went to the famous school at Cologne for his education. Preger thinks it unlikely that Albert the Great was still living, but the spirit and methods of that great teacher were still dominant there, for if he had died before Eckhart came it was shortly before.

Eckhart also studied and lectured for awhile at Paris, where he got his degree of Master about 1302, it seems by some special influence of Boniface VIII. In 1304 he was made provincial of his order for Saxony, and three years later vicar-general for Bohemia, and was clothed with authority to institute needed reforms in the convents of that region. He lectured and preached with great power in different parts of Germany, and made a second stay in Paris. Later he was prior at Frankfort on the Main, and provincial at Cologne, where he taught in the famous Dominican school and had many pupils.

He was much loved and admired by his pupils, and his moral influence over them was great and salutary. He was very devout, and pure beyond suspicion or blame. He says once that he "baptized himself seven times a day in the blood of Christ," and gives the prayer he was accustomed to repeat. It is full of humility, confession of sin and pleading for cleansing. He mentions as one of the most precious gifts of grace to him that he had been freed from carnal desires. The enemies who resented his discipline, and later attacked his teachings, could bring no charge against the uprightness and purity of his conduct. But many of his teachings were very strange, hard to understand, and often utterly out of harmony with received opinions. Moreover there were mystic teachers of heresy in the neighborhood, and Eckhart seemed to be in sympathy with them both personally and in his teaching. So it came about that charges of heresy were made against him at the instance of his bishop. Nicholas of Strasburg, a brother Dominican and himself a mystic, was appointed by the pope to look into the matter. As was natural, Eckhart was acquitted. But the bishop was not satisfied and renewed the charge, so that a new process was instituted in 1327. Eckhart made an

explanation, saying that he had not meant to teach contrary to the doctrines of the church, that he was misunderstood on some points and misrepresented on others, and was open to conviction if he could be proved wrong. The bishop had therefore to refer the case to the pope, and while it was pending before the papal curia Eckhart died, probably in 1327 or 1328.

After his death, in the year 1329, a papal bull was published condemning seventeen propositions from Eckhart's writings and laying eleven more under suspicion of heresy. Eckhart's explanatory and conditional statement was interpreted to be an unconditional retraction of these specified teachings. So the Catholic writers declared that he recanted his errors and died in full orthodoxy; but Preger and other Protestant writers hold that he never did recant the essential teachings of his books, but only professed a willingness to be convinced of his error.

The essence of Eckhart's system was the "mystical union" with God. This he represented in such terms as practically amount to an identification of the soul with God. Thus he says:¹ "He who standeth at all times in a present Now, in him doth God the Father bring forth his Son without ceasing." "In every man who hath utterly abandoned self God must communicate himself according to all his power, so completely that he retains nothing in his life, in his essence, in his nature, in his Godhead." In other words, God is humanized in the mystic, and so the mystic becomes divine. Further: "God and I are one in knowing. God's essence is his knowing, and God's knowing makes me to know him. Therefore is his knowing my knowing. The eye whereby I see God is the same eye whereby he seeth me. My eye and the eye of God are one eye, one vision, one knowledge, and one love." These daring and obscure utterances can be matched with many similar ones. It is true that on the other hand many noble sayings and true thoughts are to be found, for example: "Good works do not make holiness; it is holiness that makes good works." Yet it does not seem possible to acquit him of pantheistic speculations, of extreme and misleading

¹ Quotations are from Vaughan.

statements, and of exalting too much the individual experience as authority. Along with this, his use of Scripture is even more free and sophistical than that of the scholastics. It must mean what he says. And his conception of the fundamental doctrines of grace is essentially defective. Sin, repentance, faith unto salvation, find little place in his system. He preached mostly to monks and nuns urging those who are already converted to attain to fullness of union with God.

One of the most notable pupils of Eckhart was Henry Suso, or Seuse (1295-1366). He was born near Constance toward the end of the thirteenth century. His father was a knight and worldly, his mother a pious woman of the sentimental type. The union was incongruous and unhappy; and the boy was like his mother and much influenced both by her nature and training. He was placed quite young in the Dominican cloister at Constance, after his father had given up all hopes of making a knight of him. Here for years he went through a series of mental sufferings and self-imposed bodily tortures, seeking peace. Meantime his studies went on, some of Eckhart's writings came into his hands, and he was after a while sent to Cologne, where he enjoyed immediate instruction from the celebrated Master. He became thoroughly imbued with Eckhart's teachings, and secretly carried on much of the asceticism that he had practised in his cloister. It was not until his fortieth year that he abandoned this extreme rigidity of asceticism, and then because in an illness he came to see that it was endangering his life. Yet he did not regret having thus broken himself in.

He filled various positions in his order at different places, suffered some persecution for supposed heretical views, and was accused of other things—unjustly—and made to suffer much. The trouble between pope and emperor, and the laying of the land under interdict was a sore trial to the cause of religion. Suso was of those who sympathized with the pope, and owing to the emperor's threats the monastery at Constance, where he was teaching, was virtually broken up, the monks driven away. During his exile he was frequently travelling and preaching in those parts of Germany where he could

safely do so. In 1346 some relaxation in the persecution made it possible to reopen the convent at Constance, and Suso returned, only after a while to be hurt in soul and reputation by a false accusation of improper relations with an evil woman. But he lived down the slander, and was, in 1348, sent by his superiors to Ulm, where he spent the rest of his life.

In his teachings he made no advance on Eckhart as to substance of thought. His views and methods were substantially the same as his master's. But he was a more popular preacher than Eckhart. While his soft and sentimental nature made him the idol of the nunneries and of the devout women in all ranks, he was yet an acceptable and moving preacher before the people. Not many of his sermons have come down to us, but they show the same doctrine as his more extended writings and exhibit traces which sustain his traditional reputation for eloquence.

Among the numerous followers of Eckhart's teaching we find the name of a certain John of Sterngassen. This latter designation was taken from a street or quarter of Strasburg, from which it would appear that he was born or lived in that city. He was a preacher of considerable power and was lector, or teacher, in Strasburg about 1318 to 1323. He was a thoroughgoing disciple of Eckhart, and went even further than he¹ in using Scripture merely as a starting point for mystical and experimental speculations. One of his sayings, quoted from Preger,² may give a taste of his mystical quality: "What in God is a working [or doing], that must be in me a feeling [i.e., a passive feeling, *Leiden*]; what in God is a speaking, that must be in me a hearing; what in God is a picturing [*Bilden*], that must be in me a beholding. All that God can do, that can the soul feel."

Bernard, Francis, Bonaventura even, have shown us how the mystical type of thought and life could be held along with active and fruitful effort for the salvation of men; and how popular preaching might be when colored by mystic thought. This is no unusual phenomenon in the history of mystic views, and finds excellent illustration

¹ Albert, *op. cit.*, sec. 21.

² *Op. cit.*, S. 245.

in the lives and works of the preachers we have now to consider, the practical mystics.

We have already met with David of Augsburg as the teacher, friend, and companion of Berthold of Regensburg.¹ But he was also something on his own account. He was a preacher to the people; and as Albert had through his pupils given mysticism a great impulse in Germany, so David by his writings, preaching, and influence did very much to make the German language the instrument of communicating religious instruction. His treatises are regarded as among the best specimens of early German prose. Little is known of his life, but the fact of his being called after Augsburg indicates that that city was his birthplace, or for a time his residence. He lived a longer time at Regensburg in the Franciscan monastery, where he was teacher of the novices, and as such instructed Berthold. After this he was again in Augsburg, where he ended his days. A contemporary writer² says, "In addressing sermons to the people he was of an excellent genius." But in his gentler and easier nature he lacked the fire and power of his more famous pupil Berthold. No specimens of his German sermons have yet come to light, but his Latin sketches and German writings indicate in his mystic teachings the influence of Augustine, Bernard, Hugo and Richard of St. Victor. It is not unlikely that he was also influenced by the prevalent mysticism among the devout women of his region, for he explains the nervous and overwrought feelings which were common, as indications that a sense of the presence of God may be too much for the bodily nature to stand. He clearly teaches the "mystic union" with God as the goal of the soul's endeavor. Preger gives the following verse of a poem, not David's but current in his time, as expressive of the mystic feeling toward God:

Flieh ich von dir,	Flee I from thee,
Du kommst zu mir.	Comest thou to me.
Verlass ich mich,	Losing myself,
So find ich dich,	I find thyself,
O überwesentliches Gut!	O superessential Good!

Contemporary with Eckhart was a certain Nicholas

¹ See *ante*, p. 256 f.; and Preger, *op. cit.*, S. 268 ff.

² Quoted by Preger, *l. c.*

of Strasburg. He it was who, being charged by the pope with the first trial of Eckhart, acquitted him. He is also called "Brother Nicholas who was lector at Cologne," but when and how long does not appear. Involved with Eckhart, he, too, was under process for heresy at Eckhart's second trial, but must have been leniently dealt with, probably for reasons of policy. Thirteen of his sermons and sketches have been printed, and there are more in manuscript. He is mystical, but by no means so scholastic as Bonaventura nor so deep and speculative as Eckhart. His aim is practical, his audiences popular, his style lively and picturesque. Of course he handles the Bible in the current arbitrary fashion; but, like other popular and practical preachers, he teaches the worthlessness of works as a means of salvation, preaches repentance, and holds up Christ as the only Saviour. The following story, quoted in several of the books from one of his sermons, illustrates not only his individual method, but a style of popular presentation of divine things which was current in his time and later. After having dwelt earnestly on the value of the sufferings of Christ on our behalf, he suddenly takes this turn: "Now we must learn to climb up on the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. And who are the right sort of tree climbers? It is they who place their love and desires nowhere else, and seek their joy and their comfort nowhere else than in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ and in his precious worthy passion. I will give you an illustration. Once a cat and a fox were taking a walk together in a field. The fox said, 'Mrs. Cat, what can you do?' The cat said, 'I can climb trees.' 'Oho!' said the fox, 'what a fine art is that.' Then said the cat, 'Mr. Fox, what can you do?' 'To be sure,' said he, 'I can do great things, and have a whole sack full of arts; if once I untie it nobody can equal me.' While they were thus talking there came greyhounds that were about to catch the fox. The cat ran up a tree, and said, 'Now, Mr. Fox, untie your sack! It's time!' 'Ah, Mrs. Cat,' said the fox, 'I lightly esteemed your art, but now it were dearer to me than all the wisdom that ever I learned.'"

The application is made to the worldly wise folks who know all manner of arts and schemes which belong to

this world, yet when death comes know not where to run for refuge, but the "good people" run to the tree of Christ's cross and passion.

But the greatest preacher among the mystics of this age was the Strasburg Dominican, John Tauler (c. 1290-1361).¹ In order, however, better to appreciate him and his preaching we must take some knowledge of his times. In 1314 there was a double election of emperor, and the allegiance of the Germans was divided between Frederick of Austria and Louis of Bavaria. The papacy became involved in the quarrel because of the appointments to church offices within the German lands. In the course of the quarrel Louis went so far as to set up a rival pope in his own interest, and John XXII. retorted by declaring the subjects of Louis free of their allegiance, and by laying the imperial lands under the terrible interdict—the suspension of all religious functions. The sympathies of the German people were divided, and the religious orders were also of divergent sentiments. The Dominicans outside of Germany were strongly for the pope, and a general chapter of the order had enjoined the members to respect the interdict. Still there were some who obeyed the emperor rather than the pope, and there were others who felt obliged by the emperor's threats to leave their homes and find refuge in places where his authority did not reach, or where the interdict was not so strictly enforced.

In addition to these political and religious disorders there were great distresses and disasters—earthquakes, floods, destruction of crops by grasshoppers, and worst of all, the plague, which appeared in 1348 and carried off thousands of the population. Along with all this there was frightful moral corruption. Hardened and encouraged by the dreadful disorders, criminals of every sort abounded and vices were unrestrained. Amid these evils the strange fanatical sect of the Flagellants arose. Companies of people made pilgrimages through the country praying and lashing themselves on the bare back till the blood ran down. As among the people so among

¹ Very much the same authorities for Tauler as for Eckhart and the other mystics. There are numerous German and several English and American editions of Tauler's sermons. Cf. Broadus, *H. P.*, p. 110 ff., Ker's *Hist. of Preaching*, p. 125 f., Pattison's *Hist. of Christian Preaching*, p. 112 f.

the clergy there were, on the one hand, the corrupt and hardened, who seemed to be plunged only the deeper into evil by the terrors of the time; and there were also the pious and thoughtful, who found in these things only a louder call to mysticism, the devout and contemplative life, separation from the world, hiding in God.

It was in this time that the saintly and faithful John Tauler lived and worked. He was born of respectable parents at Strasburg, somewhere between 1290 and 1300. Piously inclined from youth, John early entered the Dominican order and pursued at Strasburg and Cologne the regular studies required for advancement. At his home city he no doubt heard both Eckhart and John of Sterngassen preach, and at Cologne he was most probably a pupil of the great master of mysticism. Here he took the regular three years' course of theological study and added an extra one as candidate for the grade of *lector*, or teacher. It was probably in his twenty-fifth year that he was ordained and began to preach and perform other priestly functions at Strasburg. The city of Strasburg took the emperor's side in the controversy with the popes,¹ and lay under interdict from May, 1329, to about 1353, though there were relaxations toward the last of the time; and, in fact, all along the absolute cessation of all religious functions could not be enforced, because many priests disobeyed. In 1328 more rigid commands came to enforce the interdict, and on the other hand the emperor declared that the priests should celebrate the mass or quit the country. Tauler was among those who felt in duty bound to obey the pope and the superiors of his order, though it is not improbable that his sympathies lay the other way. The city of Basel also sympathized with Louis the Bavarian, but did not go so far as Strasburg in forcing the clergy to obey the emperor and carry on the services. Hence many found a refuge at Basel, where teaching in the convents and possibly some other duties were allowed. At any rate we find Tauler at Basel for a part of this time, lecturing and preaching in the Dominican school. Here he met friends of his order—Henry of Nordlingen, Suso, and others—who were mystics like himself, and also came

¹ Though John XXII. died in 1324 the fight was continued by his successors.

in contact with the "Friends of God," a body, hardly an order, of mystics. Among others there was a pious woman, Margaret Ebner, whose influence and sympathy were promotive of the mystical trend in Tauler's life. It was during this time that he established his reputation as a preacher. The sermons of this period are rather of the scholastic sort, with much Latin, and directed chiefly to monks and nuns. But they have earnestness and warmth, and attacked the faults of the monks and clergy in such downright fashion as already to awaken hostility.

Probably in 1348 Tauler returned to Strasburg, whether as teacher in the Dominican school, or convent preacher, or as "general preacher" in the order, is not certain. But there was evidently some relaxation in enforcing the interdict, and at Strasburg the last and most fruitful period of his work was accomplished. His preaching attracted large attendance and was doing much good in the stricken city.

Now comes the curious story of his "conversion"—or "second blessing," as it would now be called. The story has been attacked by Catholic scholars on various grounds, and is now generally discredited by them;¹ but Preger and other Protestants hold that this is interested criticism, and that the story is substantially true. It is to this effect: A certain pious layman from the "Oberland," probably near Basel, who was one of the "Friends of God," and a mystic, came to Strasburg to hear Tauler, being attracted by his great fame as a preacher. After hearing him several times he sought an interview with the preacher, and told him that he was, though preaching to others, not yet himself fully enlightened. He persuaded Tauler that he needed a real experience of things divine, a true losing of himself in God, and the like. Tauler was so unsettled by this that under the advice and help of this "Friend" he gave up preaching, sought retirement, and by fastings, penitence, and prayers tried to find this "higher life." His course was much censured by his friends as fanatical, and derided by his opponents as folly; but he continued it for about two years, when he reached the rest he sought, and found a new or at least a more vivid spiritual life. He now offered to preach

¹ Linsenmayer after Denifle; art. in *Wetzer und Welte*, etc.

again and was permitted to do so in the cloister chapel. A great crowd assembled. But the long trial had worn his strength and weakened his nerves, so that in standing before the people he broke into weeping, and could not preach. After some days a second opportunity came, and this time his word was with such power that men and women groaned, wept, and fainted away in intense concern and fervor. From now on a new Tauler preached. Sometimes at Cologne—where he was sent by the authorities of his order—but chiefly at Strasburg, in these fearful times of corruption, disorder, disaster, and gloom, the powerful, pleading voice of this faithful witness was heard. He spared nobody's sins, he felt for everybody's distresses, a faithful prophet, a sympathizing priest. He pointed one and all to the Saviour, whom he himself found the only refuge from his own sins and from the awful evils of the times. In such labors and preaching Tauler's last years were spent. When his mortal sickness came he received tender care at the hands of his own sister, who was prioress of a convent at Strasburg, and in a house in the garden of her establishment he entered into rest, June 16, 1361.

A considerable number of sermons attributed to Tauler have been printed in various editions. Some are undoubtedly spurious, and all are reported by other hands than his, largely as in Eckhart's case by the nuns of the convents where he preached. But enough can be counted really his own to enable us to find in these sermons strong support of the unanimous and cordial traditional testimony as to the power and character of Tauler's pulpit work. The sermons are thoroughly pervaded by the mystic ideas and spirit. They are chiefly devoted to awakening the hearers to a truer and purer Christian life, a real union of the soul with God. Incidentally they powerfully attack sin and call to repentance and faith, but their main purpose is to promote the true life in God. In use of Scripture they are allegorical and free, as was only too common, but they are more Scriptural than Eckhart's, and far more practical. They depreciate dependence upon works, and insist upon faith in Christ as the only way of salvation. In arrangement they are not at all careful of the scholastic forms, and are more like the loosely constructed homilies of former times. In style they are

lively and popular, full of illustration and imagery, fresh, piquant, sometimes too coarse for the taste of our times, but impressive and acceptable in that age.

In tone and spirit Tauler was evangelical, sincere, lofty, and pure, appealing out of his own experience of grace for a holier life and a more real union with God on the part of his hearers. All the books quote Luther's words in a letter to Spalatin, in which he warmly praises the sermons of Tauler and declares that in no German nor Latin books on theology had he found so great help as in these. Altogether, making allowance for mystical onesidedness, Roman Catholic errors, and traditional misuse of Scripture, and finding him less deeply immersed in any and all of these than most of his predecessors and contemporaries, we must consider Tauler one of the most evangelical, devout, effective preachers of the age; and one of the most worthy to be remembered with affection and respect by all ages.

4. RETROSPECT AND LESSONS OF THE PERIOD

With Tauler we may fitly close our study of this central mediæval period. After him the mystical type of preaching is still found, as we shall see, but the same year in which he died, 1361, a new voice is heard in far away England, and the newly ordained young priest, John Wiclif, sounds the first note of a revolt from papacy which is to shake the world and also make a new era in the history of preaching.

As we look back over this period and endeavor to gather up some of its lessons for our own days we shall find them abundant and instructive. The three great lines of thought and life which we have traced and studied are in some form essential and perpetual. Thinking, acting, feeling; reasoning, doing, brooding; arguing, persuading, meditating; are necessary elements of the work of preaching in all times, and for the age we have been studying we have learned to call them respectively scholastic, popular, and mystic preaching. Scholasticism was the effort to reach ultimate truth by reasoning from divinely revealed doctrines and from ecclesiastically authorized dogmas thence derived. Its data were insufficient, its method dry and monotonous, its processes subtle and often sophistical, and its results unsatisfactory; but its

grand aim was to bring, by the highest and most intense effort of the spiritually enlightened reasoning powers, all truth into systematic relation and then declare the beautiful harmony to the world. The failure of scholasticism and the fault of the preaching which it formed, show us the futility of supposing that all truth can be derived from a segment of it, and that life of any sort can be identified with a mode of thought. No philosophy is as large as truth, and no process of thinking is the whole of man's spiritual life.

The great popular preachers of the period likewise bring us a lesson. And it is, though partly both, rather encouragement than warning. The misuse of Scripture, the over use of legendary material, and the grotesque and often coarse methods employed, are the chief faults of this preaching, and they are serious ones. But its power to attract crowds of hearers, and to bring home to them, with an effectiveness rarely equalled and never surpassed, the things which the preacher himself believed, may well excite our admiration and encourage our efforts.

The mystics also teach us that avoiding the extremes of supposing ourselves one with God, and therefore either the infallible media of his mind and will, or the sinless temples of his indwelling, there is yet a higher height of communion with God than we perchance have reached, and a fuller fulness of truth than we have yet experienced. Perhaps, too, by their very errors they may lead us yet to learn that in the true surrender of self to Christ there lie raptures not yet enjoyed, and preaching power not yet attained.

And so as we look back through the thickening haze of centuries upon the colossal figure of this mediæval preaching, we see, in softened outlines and mellowed smoothness, the blending of elements that must be constant in the effort of the human soul to see and to preach the truth as it is in Jesus. The all but perfect preacher shall be he who will combine in consummate synthesis intellectual power, popular eloquence, and personal holiness—he in whom logic controls zeal and tempers piety, zeal respects logic and loves piety, and piety glorifies logic and sanctifies zeal. This message the thirteenth century brings to the twentieth, and alike by its successes and failures bids the preachers of to-day lay it well to heart.

PERIOD IV

THE TRANSITIONAL, OR REFORMATORY, AGE

1361-1572

From the times of Tauler and Wiclif to the death of John Knox.
the last of the great reformers

CHAPTER IX

THE RENAISSANCE, AND PREACHING IN THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

The new period on which we enter in this chapter extends from the death of Tauler, the greatest of the mediæval mystic preachers, to the death of John Knox, the last of the great reformers. The characteristics of preaching with which we have grown familiar in our study of the preceding period continued to display themselves, but with a falling off both of acceptability and of power. Already, as we have seen, the scholastic and popular types had begun to fall into decay, and marked evidences of weakness in the mystic type were also apparent. Yet the mystic preaching showed more life than the other two sorts, and gave, especially in the Netherlands and Germany, some help to the rising power of reformatory preaching. So that along with the decline which we have to observe in the general power of the pulpit we shall have to trace the rise of that wave of mighty reformatory preaching which began with Wiclif in the latter part of the fourteenth century, increased in volume with Savonarola near the close of the fifteenth, and reached its crest in Luther and his fellow reformers in the first half of the sixteenth. Meantime the mediæval traditions and methods were continued, but with some correction of more glaring faults, in the Catholic preach-

ing of the age. This period (1361-1572) of about two hundred years may be appropriately styled in the history of preaching the transitional or reformatory age, for it marks the passage from the traditional mediæval method and spirit in the pulpit to those of modern times.

For our studies, however, it will be desirable to divide the period into two great epochs: that of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when the forces of decay and reform struggled side by side in church and pulpit; and that of the sixteenth century, when in the Protestant Reformation preaching reached its third great historic culmination—the first two being in the fourth and in the thirteenth centuries respectively. In the earlier part of the general period, that is, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the great artistic and literary revival which is called the Renaissance lent its influence to the development of preaching; in the later epoch, the sixteenth century, the Reformation was the guiding force. In this chapter and the next we study the earlier epoch.

I. EUROPE IN THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

It will be well to recall some of the more important events in the general history of Europe before discussing the social and religious conditions which had a more direct bearing upon the pulpit of the age.

We should remember that in England this was the age of the Edwards and Henrys, of the struggle with Scotland, of the Hundred Years' War with France, of the desolating Wars of the Roses and their close in the reign of Henry VII. In Scotland the romantic age of Wallace and Bruce was followed by the fatal accession of the house of Stuart, of which the fourth James was reigning when the fifteenth century ended. In France the struggle with England absorbed the attention and strength of the nation for a century, but under Charles VII. (1422-1461), the menace of subjection to a foreign power was at last removed, and France entered on a new career of power and influence in European affairs. The monarchy was strengthened by the arts and policy of the cruel and false but sagacious Louis XI., whose two next successors became possessed with the dream of establishing French

power in Italy—a fatal inheritance to Francis I. in the next period. In Germany the emperor Charles IV. sought to alleviate the confusion and turmoil by providing for a more orderly and satisfactory election of the emperor. This he did by putting forth in 1356 the famous Golden Bull which vested the choice in seven electors, four temporal and three spiritual lords. This arrangement had great effect on all the subsequent history of Germany. The next important emperor after Charles was Sigismund, who began to reign 1410, and took hold of affairs with vigor and ability. Under him the famous council of Constance was called, which deposed the rival popes and thereby ended the long schism in the papacy, but alas, also condemned to death the noble reformer, John Huss, in 1414. The following emperors were not able to accomplish much in settling the distracted regions over which they held the nominal sovereignty. The interests and jealousies of the various principalities and cities were too great a difficulty for the statesmanship of that age to overcome. Germany must wait generations yet for her political unity. And the political chaos was enhanced by the religious dissensions which were about to bring in the Reformation. In the meantime we must not forget that in the latter part of the fourteenth century the Swiss threw off the imperial yoke and founded their sturdy little republic.

The affairs of Italy and the papacy during this period were sad enough. The political situation of Italy maintained its old confusion. Naples and Sicily constituted for a time an independent kingdom striven for by France and Spain, and eventually falling to the latter. Rome and the Papal States were in a fearful condition during the sojourn of the popes at Avignon (1305-1377). The two noble houses of Colonna (Ghibelline) and Orsini (Guelf) kept up a constant feud. In this time the visionary Rienzi tried to restore the ancient Roman republic (1347-1354), but his attempt failed. The turbulent city of Florence attained high renown in arts and letters, but was a prey to many mutations in government. Likewise the cities of Venice, Genoa, Milan, and other smaller principalities, shared in the political unrest and disunion. Not yet for Italy was there a gleam of national hope.

The papacy, too, was during all this time in a wretched state. It will be remembered that under French influence in 1305 the residence of the popes was transferred from Rome to Avignon in France, where it remained for seventy-two years—the so-called “Babylonian Captivity.” Public opinion finally induced the pope to return to Rome in 1377. But at the very next election there was a split. The Italian cardinals were determined, though in the minority, to have an Italian pope, and elected Urban VI. The French cardinals fled to Avignon and elected Clement VII., who resumed residence there. And now for a generation the world is favored with the spectacle of a divided and corrupt papacy. France favored Avignon, and Italy Rome; Spain followed France, and England Italy; Germany was divided. Efforts to heal the schism were in vain until the Council of Constance finally deposed all—there were now three—of the claimants, and declared Martin V. the rightful pope in 1417. But the end of the schism brought no moral reform. The popes that followed were by no means reformers. Pius II. (Æneas Silvius Piccolomini) was a man of letters; Innocent VIII. was given over to vices, and in his time the papal court was a sty of corruption; Alexander VI. (Borgia) was the most infamous of them all, the Nero of the papacy; Julius II. was a statesman and a warrior, by mischance a pope, and he made the states of the church a political power which endured until modern times; Leo X. (John of Medici) was a patron of arts and letters, free and easy, fond of money and luxury, supposed to be a freethinker, and certainly a very unsuitable man for the great crisis that was now at hand.

Long had Spain, with the south under Moorish rule and the north divided against itself, been of little moment in European politics. But in the latter part of the fifteenth century things took a turn. A statesman and patriot appeared in the person of Cardinal Ximenes, and to his farsighted political talents the country owed much, though his religious bigotry inflicted lasting evils upon it. In 1479 the crowns of Castile and Arragon were united by the marriage of the two heirs, Ferdinand and Isabella; in 1492 the Moors were driven out of their stronghold at Granada; and in the same notable year Columbus, under

Spanish patronage, discovered the New World and gave to Spain a prestige and wealth that lasted for generations.

This brief glance at the political situation in Europe during the two centuries we are studying reminds us that it was a time of war, ambition, oppression, cruelty, intrigue, corruption, and yet of far reaching significance in national affairs. Nor was this all, for amid the political and military strife, there was progress in other things.

The arts of peace also flourished and grew. Trade and industry, the art of wealth-production, received important stimulus and development. There was waste and extravagance, but there was also thrift. The merchant and banker became pillars in the state. Commerce grew with the discovery and opening of new lands. As the invention of gunpowder revolutionized warfare and changed the face of the world, so the invention of printing revolutionized literature and set the pace for a new era in the world of letters. The great discoverers and navigators, Vasco de Gama, Columbus, Magellan, and others, filled the world with wonder, and widened the outlook of humanity upon itself and its home. In the fifteenth century new interest was developed in the study of the exact sciences and of the great forces of nature, and this great department of human thought received some of the impulse which has given it so much ascendancy in modern times.

In the fine arts, particularly during the latter part of the time, there was great progress. Both instrumental and vocal, both secular and religious music were cultivated, and took on important developments. In architecture the noble movements of the former period went on with power. Churches, towers, castles, palaces, public buildings, bridges, and private residences, all show the great growth of the building art. In sculpture and painting the effort was made, as in music and architecture, to cultivate and impress religious ideas. The decoration of cathedrals and churches was one of the principal aims of later mediæval art; but when in the fifteenth century the revived interest in antiquity made itself felt, a new breath came to art also. The purely artistic—art for art's sake—the beautiful—the sensuous—now goes hand in

hand with the religious aims of the preceding age. One need only take a superficial glance at the walls of an art gallery to see how the devoutly religious and the sensuously beautiful struggle side by side for expression in the art of that wonderful age. The earlier Italian work of Giotto and others prepared the way for the wonderful developments of the Renaissance.

We have seen how already in the preceding period the languages of modern Europe were settling into shape, and the national literatures were beginning. That tendency goes on in this period with accelerated power, receives a great impulse from the invention of printing, and in the fifteenth century gets a new life and a new direction by the revival of learning. The strong foundations of Italian literature had already been laid by Dante (d. 1321), Petrarch (d. 1374), and Boccaccio (d. 1375). In other lands also fair beginnings had been made before the new learning came with its breath of power and life. In Germany poetry passed from the knightly and gallant kind of the Minnesingers to the more burgherly and didactic sort of the Meistersingers. German thought found expression also in some prose writings, though these were of no great or world-wide influence. In France, while the poetic strain of the early troubadours was not wholly lost, prose writing found admirable representatives in the naïve and charming Froissart (d. after 1400) and in his followers, especially Philip de Comines (1445-1509), whose narrative of the events of his time is highly valued. In England poetry had its great representative in Chaucer (1328-1400), and prose in the marvellous traveller's tales of Sir John Mandeville (d. 1372).

All these earlier developments prepared the ground for the seed of the new learning which fell richly upon it about the middle of the fifteenth century. All departments of human thought—philosophy and religion as well as art and literature—were powerfully affected by this great movement, which is variously described as the Renaissance, the Revival of Learning, or of Letters, and Humanism—that is, the study of the Greek and Latin classics. Broadly speaking, it was a fresh, intense and naturally one-sided and extreme devotion to the art and literature of ancient Greece and Rome. Like every other

literary cult it had its sound and its corrupt elements, its serious aims and its laughable follies, its good and its bad results.

The movement, as was natural, began in Italy, and spread through Europe. Petrarch and Boccaccio were both good Greek and Latin scholars, and their work and example encouraged a taste for classical studies among their admirers and followers.

In 1453 the fall of Constantinople sent many Greek scholars westward, and these found welcome and profit in many of the Italian cities. Notably did the wealthy, cultured, and powerful Medici at Florence encourage this tendency of literature and art; and under the rule of Lorenzo the Magnificent, that fair city became a flourishing center of the new culture. Able and distinguished scholars as well as famed artists added luster to that "city of flowers and flower of cities," as it was proudly called. Here the study of Plato was a reigning fad. Here lived Politian, Marsilius Ficinus and Pico di Mirandola, that wonder of knighthood and culture. And here in their time, as we shall see, preached the stern and eloquent prophet of the age, Savonarola. In other parts of Italy the new learning also had brilliant representatives, such as the Cardinal Bembo and Laurentius Valla, and last but by no means least the popes, Nicholas V., Pius II.—who, as Æneas Silvius Piccolomini, was known to fame as an eminent Humanist before he became pope,—and Leo X., the son of Lorenzo dei Medici, who was on the papal throne and devoted to literature and art when Luther began what the easy-going pontiff was pleased to regard as a "quarrel of monks," but history calls the Reformation.

From Italy the movement spread into other lands. Passing Germany for the present let us recall that in England the new love of learning came with power and laid enduring foundations. John Colet (d. 1519), dean of St. Paul's, and a preacher of force, was an admirable Greek scholar who had studied in Italy and taught with enthusiasm at Oxford. In France the scholarly work of Faber Stapulensis (as the Latinized form has the name) and others belong to this period.

In the Netherlands learning was in touch with piety.

The mystics had not lost influence there. The Brethren of the Common Life, a society founded by the pious and popular preacher Gerhard Groot, gave special attention to the education of the young. Among them in their earlier days studied the gentle Thomas à Kempis; and later, when their greatest leaders were gone and their teaching somewhat deteriorated, came first John Wessel and afterwards Erasmus to get a start in learning in the schools of the Brethren. The names of these two men bring us to the new learning in Germany and its relation to the Reformation.

John Wessel¹ (c. 1420-1489) was born of honest middle-class people at Groningen, and received his early education in the school of the Brethren of the Common Life at Zwoll. It is probable that he at this time came also under the influence of Thomas à Kempis, who lived in the cloister at Agnesberg nearby. The youth was both pious and in love with learning. He pursued his studies at Cologne, Lyons, Paris, Basel, and in Italy. He taught and lectured at many of these places, and was specially influential at Heidelberg in building up the university, on which he left a deep impress. Here after his time some of the leading lights of the Reformation—Melanchthon, Brentz, Butzer—studied, and no doubt felt the influence which Wessel had left behind him. In Italy he came in contact with many of the earlier scholars, and later he was associated with Reuchlin. Along with his learning his pious life and evangelical views prepared the minds of many of his pupils for the coming religious upheaval.

Vast and important as are the interests of nations and of culture during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the affairs of religion are also passing through one of the most tremendous crises of history and approaching the great revolution of the sixteenth century. Catholic writers love to speak of the mediæval centuries—especially the thirteenth—as the “ages of faith.” But even at its best the sway of the papacy was not, and could not be, complete. Much less so in the years of darkness and corruption. Even as far as Rome taught Christian truth and correctly represented the Christian spirit, it still

¹ Ullmann's *Reformers before the Reformation*, Vol. II. (Eng. transl.), gives an elaborate account of Wessel.

had to meet the perennial opposition of evil, enmity without and corruption within. Nor was the church ever without the questioning presence inside its fold of those who were more or less discontented with many of its doctrines and practices. And further, there were the so-called heretics who declared from the outside that the Scriptures taught a simpler and purer form of faith and practice than was found in the Roman system. And lastly, there were then, as always, extremists and visionaries of every sort. The awful moral degradation into which the papacy fell during this time made it utterly unfit to contend against the forces of decay on the one hand and of reform on the other, and it is the conflict of these two sets of forces that constitutes the religious history of this great period.

It is well known that the state of religion in this time was very low. Corruption in doctrine and life was general and extreme. The plain annals of the age relate facts that make us blush for our race; the satirists expose and denounce with unsparing hand the vices and follies that prevailed; and the preachers describe, lament and attack sin in many forms and places. The picture of the corrupt age is painted in glaring colors by those who could look directly upon the things of which they tell. Yet, bad as it was, the darkness was relieved by some rays of light. The pure and pious were found even in those evil days; quiet mystics sought God in retirement, and noble spirits, both among clergy and people, were found who lived in this evil world the life of faith and virtue. And not only in the way of satire, but also of heart-breaking sorrow and earnest rebuke, reformers thundered against sins from which they themselves firmly abstained. Nor were there utterly wanting, both among faithful men and excellent women, those who visited the fatherless and widows in their affliction and kept themselves unspotted from the world. In simple justice to the things that make for righteousness we should bear these facts in mind when we come to look more narrowly upon the evil features of the time. One of the worst of these—the corruption of the clergy—we come now to consider.

Adequately to describe the character of the Catholic clergy from the days of Wiclif to those of Luther would

tax the picturing powers of a Dante or a Burke. Yet the facts themselves, stated as briefly and as simply as possible, carry their own sad and awful impression without aid from the genius of poet or orator. There was a mediæval proverb¹ to the effect that if a man would enjoy himself for a little while let him kill a chicken, if for a year let him marry a pretty wife, if for life let him become a priest. The easy and envied life of a priest, however, was only the lot of the more favored. Many of them were poor and had to contend with hardships. But there were among the prelates and those who had the better places luxury and easy living that almost baffle belief. Along with these there was a worldliness, a carelessness, a moral obliquity that are only too well attested. Even when we make all necessary deductions for the exaggerated lampoons of the satirists, the idle tales of the people, and the overstatements of aroused and indignant reformers, the real facts at bottom are hideous enough. Ignorance and incompetence were small faults in comparison with the moral unfitness which disgraced the clergy of the age. Avarice and luxury, greed and ambition, simony and extortion, went together. And, worse than these, open concubinage and general looseness of life are well-known sins of the secular clergy. The monks were no better, and even the nunneries did not escape censure. The papacy set the example. Petrarch said that the court of the popes at Avignon was a place where the hope of heaven and the fear of hell were regarded as old fables, where virtue was esteemed an affair for peasants, and sin was regarded as a sign of manly independence. Such moral degradation excited the scorn of the world, aroused the conscience of the upright, drew the tears of the godly, and call on all in tones of thunder for a "reformation of the church in head and members." But little was that call heeded by popes and councils. The answer to it was to come in another way.

In the upper classes of society—the princes and rulers and gentry—there was a moral laxity which shows itself only too plainly in the annals of the age and its other literature. The ties of morality and religion sat very lightly indeed upon the seared consciences of many who esteemed

¹ Quoted by Hase in his Church History somewhere.

themselves the nobility of earth. Cruelty, violence, oppression, fraud, lying and shameless vice stained the powerful and wealthy. The extravagance, luxury, dissoluteness of many fashionable women were only equalled by the corresponding and further-going vices of the men. As for religious belief, it was the exception, and the exception itself was marred by superstition and corruptions of doctrine. But not all of the nobility were bad, there were some illustrious exceptions.

Among the people generally, with such examples of evil as the clergy and upper classes set, the corruption of morals and the degradation of religion were fearful. We may spare ourselves the description of details. Murder, robbery, theft, fraud, unchastity, abounded. No wonder men thought the end of the world must soon come and sweep away a people so sunken in iniquity. In what passed for the Christian religion fearful abuses in practice and wretched corruptions of doctrine went hand in hand with superstitions that well might seem incredible, did not eye-witnesses attest them, and their remnants still prove them to have been sober facts. Magic, miracle, witchcraft and deviltry were all believed in and practised! Relics of the saints were worshipped, and, of course, the saints themselves. Ecstasies and visions, prophecies and miracles were accepted as real divine interpositions by even the pious, while absurd and wicked impostures were freely practised and apparently believed, not only by the innocent people, but even, to some extent, by the cheats themselves! The sale of indulgences, the laxity of discipline, the externalism that corroded the religious life, added to the moral disorders.

Truly it was a time for reform. The better spirits of the age felt this deeply, and there was a deep and growing conviction among all classes that things should and must be changed. In many a quiet home pious parents taught their children virtue and the fear of God; the art of printing spread Bibles and good books among the people; the Brethren of the Common Life in the Netherlands, and similar organizations elsewhere, cultivated and spread piety; in many of the cloisters there were devout mystics who called upon God in prayer; and here and there some brave reformer lifted up his voice and spared not to show this decayed house of Israel its sins.

2. THE PREACHING OF THE TIMES

The state of the Catholic pulpit during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries may be comprehensively and accurately described as one of decay. The mighty forward movement of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had reached its limit, and the inevitable reaction followed. Yet, of course, preaching did not suddenly change either its inner character or its external forms and methods, and among these were many elements of permanent value. Besides this conservation of many good features there was the rising protest of the reformatory element, which was more and more making itself felt, till it accomplished a revolution early in the sixteenth century. And so, both the conservative (in a measure) and the reformatory forces of preaching maintained, in the time we are now considering, a struggle against the forces of decline. But these, upon the whole, were in the ascendant.

Let us first pay attention to some of those acquired and preserved characteristics of preaching, which still meet us in the pulpit of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Some of these were good, and some evil, and some mixed. It is not necessary to make this discrimination formally, as it will speak for itself in the discussion, but it should be borne in mind throughout.

The three modes of thought and method which prevailed in the preceding epoch are still found, but all with distinct loss of power—the scholastic, popular and mystic.

Toward the close of the thirteenth century the great masters of the scholastic type of preaching had passed away. Small imitators of the great men now abounded and made the method ridiculous. The wearisome divisions, the tedious refinements, the useless distinctions and vapid subtleties made up only a galvanized corpse, or a dancing skeleton as in some puppet show, instead of a live and vigorous body. The description of the degenerate scholastics of the age given by Erasmus in his *Praise of Folly* has been often cited. He tells how, in the first place, they would begin with an invocation borrowed from the poets; then they would have an exordium of some far-fetched and extravagant nature drawn from

the river Nile, or Bel and the Dragon, or the signs of the zodiac, or squaring the circle, or from the elements of grammar, or forced etymologies and the forms of words, all artificial and pedantic to a degree. The third stage would be what in the old rhetoric is called the "narration," or "statement of the case," and here the text of Scripture would be given or slightly alluded to. The fourth part—the main body of the discourse—would introduce almost a new person, for here our scholastic becomes a mighty theologian, and propounds the most wonderful theological subtleties, touching on things found in neither heaven nor earth; and to tickle the ears of the hearers he would adduce the great doctors, the "subtle," the "irrefragable," the "seraphic," and the like; and then would come syllogisms and corollaries, and all sorts of scholastic fooleries. Finally, there would be the "fifth act," in which the preachers show the greatest art by bringing in as application and illustration some fable or legend—the more marvellous and absurd the better—which they proceed to interpret "allegorically, tropologically, and anagogically." Thus these declaimers would produce their "chimeras," more ungainly than the famous one satirized by Horace in the *Ars Poetica*, where the literary painter is said to portray a human head, with a horse's neck, the feathered body of a bird, and the tail of a fish. The pen of the erudite Dutchman was dipped in gall, but there are many witnesses to the essential truth of his caustic description. Truly scholastic preaching was in the sere and yellow leaf!

Yet, as a slight offset to the sad decay, Rothe approvingly mentions the very thing which Erasmus criticises in the application, or fifth part, of the scholastic sermon, namely, the use of fables, legends and other illustrations. This came as a relief from the abstruse and severely doctrinal and analytical character of the strict scholastic method, and was an approach to the freer and more effective popular style.

In the popular preaching of the age traces of all the other types—scholastic, mystic, and reformatory—are found in various degrees. Yet it is proper to retain this class of preachers for separate consideration because it is important to remember that in this age appeal to the mul-

itude was still effectively made by preachers of popular gifts.

As is ever the case in this kind of preaching the preachers fall into three sorts: (1) Those who draw and impress the people by sincere and earnest effort to do good, by good example, by heart-to-heart appeal, by what is meant to be sound evangelical teaching; (2) Those who are chiefly indeed bent on good, but allow themselves large liberty in the use of devices to attract and catch the crowd, such as sensational oddities, humor, and even worse things; (3) Those who see in these devices ends rather than means, and seem to be more intent on making a sensation and raising a laugh than on anything else. Rothe¹ says: "These droll preachers are by no means particular in the choice of their entertaining material; and, along with some real sparks of wit, they heap together the worst platitudes, the most trivial jests, and not seldom downright vulgarities and indecencies. Gabriel Barletta, Olivier Maillard, and Michel Menot—all scholastic preachers—are the leaders of this sort of thing. And precisely in such cases as they do we see that even earnest preachers did not consider this drollery beneath their dignity."

Throughout the whole mediæval period, as we have seen, there are traces of the burlesque and sensational in preaching. But in the fifteenth century, and especially in Italy and France, this always questionable and often thoroughly evil tendency found frequent and exaggerated expression.² It is almost incredible to what a degree of irreverence, absurdity, and even indecency this sort of thing was carried. Some of the stories and gibes found in sermons of that age are almost as bad as anything related by Boccaccio. An Italian saying in commendation of any spicy and not too delicate joke was that "it was good enough for a sermon."

Even some of the better preachers, men with really serious aims and personally of excellent character, were not free from this fault, and in the hands of less able and seri-

¹ *Gesch. der Pred.*, S. 261.

² Marengo, *L'Oratoria Sacra Italiana*, cap. IV.; A. Méray, *Les Libres Prêcheurs devanciers de Luther et de Rabelais*; Rothe, *Gesch. der Pred.*, SS. 261 ff., 290 ff.

ous men it became a shame and disgrace which no amount of special pleading can justify, and the bad taste of the age can only partially palliate. One of the better sort of the Italian preachers¹—himself by no means above reproach—writes: “Preachers ought to abstain from levity and not speak idle words and stories to provoke a laugh. Even if sometimes it is necessary to make the people attentive by some modest pleasantry, let it be done moderately and rarely.” But of this sage counsellor of moderation to his brethren the following story is told:² He had a female admirer who objected to his monk’s habit as unbecoming, and said she would like to see him clad in knightly array. He told her to come to hear him preach next day and she should see him and hear him address the people clothed in full panoply. He dressed himself in all the flashy garb of a knight and covered it all with his monastic gown. Thus he began to preach, and took occasion in his sermon to urge the princes and knights to go a-crusading against the Saracens and Turks. He lamented the unwillingness of the rulers to engage once more in this holy warfare, and declared if nobody else would lead he was ready to lay aside his Franciscan gown and put himself at the head of an expedition. Upon this he put off his gown, and stood, a flashing knight with drawn sword; and in this costume he proceeded with his discourse. Even if, in justice to the man, we discredit the alleged motive of vanity that was back of this performance, it was a useless bit of sensationalism and insincerity. Nobody was going on a crusade then, and he was sharp enough to know it.

In an Easter sermon Gabriel Barletta—of whom more will be said later—discoursed thus:³ “After his resurrection the Lord was looking for a messenger to carry the glad news to his mother. A number offered themselves. Adam said, Let me go, because I was the cause of evil. No, you won’t do, because you are too fond of figs and might stop in the road. Abel said, Let me go. No; you

¹ Robert of Lecce, quoted by Marenco, *l. c.*

² By Rothe, S. 262, on the authority of Henry Stephens. Marenco also tells the story, only he leaves out the incident of the sweetheart.

³ Rothe, S. 264. Used by Longfellow in Friar Cuthbert’s sermon in *The Golden Legend*.

might meet Cain, and he would kill you. Then Noah would undertake the business. No; you drink too freely. John the Baptist couldn't go, because he wore hairy clothes; and the penitent robber was rejected because his legs were broken. Finally an angel was sent, who raised the song, *Regina coeli, laetare! Alleluia! Resurrexit sicut dixit! Alleluia!*" What trifling and irreverence! and that by a man of real talent, and of generally serious aims! Barletta also, in one of his sermons,¹ tells a story which some readers may recognize as having been related of a much respected minister of recent times in Virginia.² A certain priest, in celebrating the mass, observed a woman who seemed much touched, and freely wept as he intoned the service. After it was over he spoke to the woman and asked the cause of her emotion, and she told him it was his voice, which reminded her tenderly of her recently deceased ass!

Marenco³ says that the excess of this way of preaching became such a scandal that the Lateran Council of 1512 was led to pass its rule forbidding it, and that provincial councils, and later the Council of Trent, acted in the same direction. It is worthy of note that the abuse was so great as to call for this high authoritative repression.

Meantime the mystic type of preaching had also some representatives in this age. Along the Rhine, and especially in the Netherlands, as well as to some extent in France and other countries, we find them. Some of these preachers will claim notice later; here it is sufficient to remark that the mystic preaching of this time was chiefly derived from the masters of the past and did not offer, either in its representatives or its teachings, much of independence.⁴

In regard to the composition and delivery of sermons, there is not much new to tell, as the customs of preceding times were still much in vogue. But several points of homiletic interest require notice.

Besides homiletic helps in the way of collections of

¹ Told by Méray, *op. cit.*

² I am glad to run down this foolish story and show that it is as old as it is silly.

³ *Op. cit.*, beginning of cap. V.

⁴ Rothe, S. 267.

material there were put forth in this time a few books which taught the art of discourse. Early in the fifteenth century Nicholas of Clemanges¹ (a pupil of Gerson), in his general work, *De Studio Theologico*, had given some excellent precepts about preaching. Near the same time two Germans published works which, though somewhat crude, made real advance in homiletical theory.² Later, probably early in the sixteenth century, two more German works appeared.³ The first bore the title *Tractatus de Modo Dicendi et Docendi ad Populum Sacra, seu de Modo Prædicandi*, and had for its author one Jerome of Dungersheim. Cruel gives an outline of the work and speaks favorably of it. The other was the *Manuale Curatorum* of Ulrich Surgant, which treats of such subjects, as, What is preaching, Who should preach, How one should preach, Different kinds of preaching, Subjects of preaching, Memorizing, Delivery, and the like. Thus we see that, while the theory of preaching was not wholly neglected, and many practical teachings were given in various ways, there were no really great or important works on Homiletics during this time.⁴

From these books and from the sermons themselves we may gather something as to the contents and form of the discourses of the period. The two matters may be briefly treated together. With differences in detail according to persons, subjects and circumstances, the prevailing method of discourse was about as follows: First, there would be an invocation or brief prayer for divine guidance, then an exordium, or *prothema*, an introduction to awaken interest or pleasure in the hearers. This was not at all or only remotely connected with the subject, and sometimes was far-fetched and bombastic. Then would come the *thema*, that is, the text or passage of Scripture, read in Latin, sometimes translated into the vernacular, and sometimes briefly explained word for word. This, if extended at all, was called *postillating*,⁵

¹ Id., S. 269.

² Cruel, S. 596 ff.

³ Id., S. 599 ff.

⁴ Those of Reuchlin, Erasmus and Melanchthon of course belong to a later date.

⁵ The name *postil* for sermon has this origin: In the worship the sermon followed immediately upon the reading of the Scriptures, and the preacher was accustomed to introduce his comment by saying, "After these words of the text," etc. (*Post illa*

and was like the ancient homily. Sometimes, if the *postil* was of much length, it might take the whole time and become the sermon, with only the conclusion added. But more commonly the theme, or announcement and brief explanation of the text, was a subordinate affair, and then came the *dispositio*, or arrangement, the division and statement of the plan of discourse. With the scholastics this was very elaborate; with others it was subordinate and brief. Next came the argument or proof, or discussion and elaboration, with quotations from the teachers of the church. Here, too, was room for scholastic abuses, but the popular sermons would rather here be more polemic in tone and perhaps briefer. Last would come the anecdotes, fables, stories, comparisons, drawn from nature, from habits of animals and all sorts of things, by way of illustration and impression. Finally would be the *admonitio* or *conclusio*, with a brief closing prayer.

Such were the general form and contents of the preaching of these centuries. We see how little place the explanation and real enforcement of the Word of God was likely to have, and in most cases did have, in sermons of this construction. Scholastic subtleties with the more learned and their imitators, examples and tales with the more popular and easy going, were the main contents. As to the doctrine and morals the case continued as in the former times. The prevailing theology of mediæval Romanism was the staple of dogma. The morals of Christianity were usually clearly taught, but with admixture of external churchly regulations and the evils of the teaching concerning penance and indulgences. Among preachers of the reformatory tendency, the attack upon sin and corruption was the main thing in preaching, and many of these men were fearless and able in their polemic, assailing all classes of men and all species of sin without fear or favor.

The Latin still held some place as the language of *verba textus*, etc.). So the homily came to be called the *postilla*, from whence a verb *postillare* was made, and a noun *postillatio* to describe the action. The word occurs in Wiclif's writings and other old English literature, but is now obsolete in English, though not entirely so in other languages. Readers of Luther will remember that his Home-Talks are called *Hauspostillen*. See Cruel, S. 123.

spoken sermons. These were mostly, as formerly, those given before universities, church assemblies, in cloisters, and the like; but still some were delivered to the people in Latin, and very many, as in the past, were written out and published in that tongue. But naturally the use of the vernacular gained ground, and, especially among reformers and popular preachers, tended entirely to displace Latin as the language of the pulpit.

As to the delivery of sermons, there is not much to add to what has been said of prevalent customs in the Middle Ages.¹ Places, hours, congregations, length of sermons, occasions, remained as described. The three methods of preparation were employed: some men memorized, some extemporized, some preached from notes. In regard to this Cruel says:² "As regards the delivery of the sermon itself, manifold division and subdivision of scholastic sermons, and the multitude of learned citations makes it in many cases scarcely conceivable how such a discourse could be committed and recited from memory. But for that it was customary to use the help of short memory cards, or even the sketch itself, which would be taken into the pulpit. Surgant says on this point: 'He who has naturally a weak memory and cannot remedy it by art must lay before himself a paper with the main and subordinate divisions written on it, or, if he can, the whole sermon, not to read it word for word, but only from time to time to glance at it.' " Bare reading, then, seems not to have been practised, but only memoriter or extemporaneous preaching, frequently with the help of more or less full notes. Doubtless the individual differences of delivery were as marked as among us. Erasmus satirizes the extravagant and ridiculous gestures and inflections of the showy preachers, and the sensational men no doubt resorted to many tricks of delivery for effect. One amusing thing is noticed by Cruel.³ Sometimes the preachers, when they got to a new division, would say, "Now clear your throats, for this matter is important and must be heard," or, "Clear your throats now, I will soon let you go," or, "This ends the first division, if any one has to cough or clear his throat, this is the place." Sometimes this was done as a device to rouse the congre-

¹ *Ante*, p. 192 f.

² *Op. cit.*, S. 633 f.

³ S. 634.

gation, and sometimes for this purpose the preacher would put in some lively and not always respectable anecdote. So much for the sermon and its delivery; we must now turn our attention to other matters. (Meantime the weary reader may clear his throat or otherwise refresh himself for a new phase of the subject!)

Enough has already been said to show that, except for the note of reform which is heard in some of the preaching of the time, the sermons of the later fourteenth and all the fifteenth century give evidence of marked degeneration. Yet we must dwell longer on the painful topic and point out more in detail what has thus far been only incidentally discussed.

We have already had occasion to speak of the low character of the clergy during this epoch.¹ Much ignorance, immorality, luxury and ambition, laziness, avarice, and other evil things have to be charged to their account. And this of course was at once both cause and evidence of decay in the pulpit. For in all times the character of the preacher either enforces or enfeebles his preaching. And where the average of character is bad, no matter how noble the exceptions may be, the average of preaching will necessarily be low. Where there is lack of true piety and conviction in the preacher the pulpit work tends to become empty, formal, frigid and without moving effect. And this is the character of much of the preaching of that age.

Always one of the signs of degenerate preaching—as of any literary production—is a slavish dependence upon others, past or present, a want of independence, originality, freshness. Copyists and imitators are found in every age, it is true, but when the masters belong chiefly to a former generation and the small followers mostly abound, the fall is great.

So was it now. We have seen how in all the Middle Ages, from the days of Gregory the Great, and notably in the age of Charlemagne and after, the preachers freely appropriated material from the past and present. In fact the best of them did it without scruple, and the less capable were encouraged to use without stint collections of sermons and other prepared material. This plagiarism

¹ *Ante*, p. 297 f.

and dependence were not regarded as morally wrong, nor does the fatal effect upon preaching seem to have been appreciated. In the decadent age of which we now treat this wretched practice had full swing and was one of the worst symptoms of the prevalent decline.¹

All sorts of homiletical helps abounded. Some might have been legitimate and useful if wisely handled, but generally they were a temptation to the weak and a snare to the lazy. There were books of outlines, collections of various sorts of material, from so-called "flowers" derived from Scripture and other sources, to fables, tales, illustrations gathered from nature and elsewhere. The invention of printing made it possible to multiply these books, and many of them had great vogue. In addition to these helps, which required at least some effort on the part of the preacher to use in his work, there were collections of ready-made sermons at the disposal of the brethren. One of these actually bore the title of *Parati Sermones*, prepared sermons.² The author is unknown, but the book was one of the most popular of the kind, having passed through seventeen editions. The discourses are presented in a simple and clear arrangement and in a style "easily memorized," and were especially popular because they gave so many examples and illustrations. But another collection surpassed even this in popularity, having gone through twenty-five editions. This was the work of a certain John of Werdena and bore the whimsical but significant title of *Sermones Dormi Secure*, that is, "Sleep Well Sermons."³ The title is explained in a brief introduction, which is couched in these terms: "Here happily begin the Sunday Sermons with expositions of the Gospels through the year, quite well known and useful to all priests, pastors and chaplains, which are also called by the other title of Sleep Well, or, Sleep without Care, for this reason, that without much study they may be appropriated and preached to the people." A few of the sermons are themselves borrowed from other sources, but they are mostly the author's own, who

¹ Noted in all the authorities, but especially well in Cruel, S. 451 ff.

² Cruel, S. 474 ff.

³ *Op. cit.*, S. 478 ff.; and Broadus, *Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, p. 141 (new ed.).

was spoken of by Trithemius as a "very celebrated declaimer of popular sermons in his time."

One outline may suffice as a specimen of his art. The text is Mark 6:48, "The wind was contrary to them;" and this is the statement of the plan: "There are four spiritual winds which are contrary to us and move the sea of this world: 1. The east wind blows when a man reflects on the sorrowful condition in which he entered this life. 2. The west wind, when he reflects on bitter death. 3. The south wind, when he thinks of the joys of eternity. 4. The north wind, when he thinks of the terrors of the last judgment."

Besides this weak dependence and wholesale plagiarism the preaching of the age showed all the accumulated faults of the past with which our studies have made us familiar. There is no need to repeat them here; but only to remind the reader that doctrine was corrupt, Scripture interpretation allegorical and strained and otherwise faulty, morality often dubious, legends and tales superabundant, and scholastic refinements and excesses unduly prevalent. But degenerate as preaching generally was, we must not forget that there were also indications of the saving presence of a noble life and power. It was not all bad, and to the rise and growth of this better kind of preaching, its nature and effects, we must now give attention.

Beginning with Wiclif, in the second half of the fourteenth century, a new note is heard in preaching. This does not mean that none before him had preached reform by attacking evils and appealing to Scripture as authority against churchly corruptions in doctrine and practice; but it does mean that in lifting up his mighty voice in this way he spoke differently from the most of his contemporaries, and he spoke not wholly in vain. The spirit of the true reformer is not that of the satirist who sees evil and derides it, nor that of the pessimist who sees it only to despair; nor that of the pious mystic, who flees before it to the withdrawn and introspective life; but that of the leader of men, who combines whatever is good in all these ways of regarding evil and adds to them the courage to attack and the hope to overcome, or, at least, to abate the ills of his time.

Was there demand for this new spirit and this new method in preaching? Surely. All those crying abuses which we have reviewed as evils existing in the social and religious life of the times, and as marks of degeneracy in the pulpit, blended into a loud and imperative call for preaching of a sort different from that which prevailed in the two centuries just preceding the Reformation. The wretched and sinful state of society loudly demanded men who should, like John of old, speak in the spirit and power of Elias. And while this is true of every age, from that of Noah to our own, the call came with an emphasis of its own in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries of European history. If ever the world needed the preaching of a pure gospel it was then; if anything could put a saving leaven into that mass of evil it must be a renewal of real Christianity.

And yet at this very crisis, nay, as a part of the crisis, it was true that the great body or hierarchy claiming to be the representative of God and the authorized interpreter of God's will on earth, was itself marred by unspeakable corruptions in life and doctrine. The religious guides of the people were many of them shamefully and hopelessly corrupt. If men were to be saved by preaching, it must be through preachers different from these. And in doctrine the lapse was equally grave and more widely diffused, for even the good preachers held a very badly mixed theology. It may well be that among some of the so-called heretics of this time there could be found a purer type of doctrine than that which prevailed among the Catholic clergy, but no sermons of theirs have come down to tell us what they preached. The current Roman Catholic doctrine, with all its unscriptural and anti-scriptural accretions, was the staple of the sermons that have survived. Surely it was time for a new note to be heard. What more emphatic call for a true gospel preaching can there be than is found in the co-existence of a depraved ministry and a corrupted theology?

With all these things there was a widespread awakening of conscience in regard to the fearful evils and corruptions of the times. The better spirits of the age looked on these things with grief and shame, and came more and more to feel that upon them rested some responsibility

to improve the condition of the world. Among the weak and sinful, too, there was a growing feeling of penitence and desire for better things. Such a feeling as this in a former age preceded and helped to produce the crusades and the great preaching which distinguished the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; in this era it preceded and helped to produce the Reformation and the great Protestant preaching of the sixteenth century. Ullmann well says:¹ "The religious and moral preparation for the Reformation consisted in this, that the Christian spirit found in the members of the Church a new and mighty revival, both in the way that more inward interest of the understanding toward Christian truth was aroused, and that the moral feeling was awakened and sharpened; led back from the outwardness of works to the inwardness of feeling and will."

This awakening of conscience showed itself in many different ways, and was found in many different places. Rulers, statesmen, men of affairs, scholars and literary men, as well as preachers, and pious mystics of both sexes, felt and expressed the need for a renovation of Christian life and teaching, and for a "reformation of the church in head and members." Did all the blended tones of this call go unheeded?

In the preaching of the age there was found with more or less of distinctness and power some response to these earnest demands for reform. In some sense it is generally true that the sermons that have come down to us contain traces of the reformatory tendency, but in many of them it is only a trace. Yet even that is worth something as an indication that the pulpit, decadent as it was in many respects, was not wholly deaf to the call for a better teaching and enforcement of Christian truth.

The most widespread, conspicuous, and, at the same time, easiest part of reform preaching was found in its attack on the corruptions which disgraced the age and compelled the attention of men. This is the necessary commonplace of all reformatory movements, and is greatly in evidence in the sermons of this time. The preacher shared this critical attitude with the philosopher, the historian, the literary man; and these might be mere

¹ *Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, Bd. II., S. 4.

cynics and satirists, showing and denouncing corruption, but not helping much to remove the evils of which they complained. No doubt some of the preaching of the age—as is true of all ages—went no further than this, nor are there wanting indications to support this reasonable inference. The preacher might even thunder in the pulpit against the sins of which he was himself guilty in private. Judas might condemn avarice and treachery, and Simon Magus inveigh with holy horror against the sale and purchase of so-called spiritual dignities, at least of churchly offices. Alas! sometimes the most loud-mouthed assailer of evils is not by any means a reformer.

But a degree better than this cheap and perfunctory attack upon sin was the work of men who, like Barletta, Geiler and Maillard, were good in life and serious in purpose, and yet fell short of being real reformers because they lacked the best spirit and the best method. They scolded and ridiculed, and used plain language, and feared nobody; but they brought no thorough reformation. Nothing is wanting to the completeness of their diagnosis and the painful thoroughness of their probing; but the balm of Gilead is not found in their hands, nor is the health of the daughter of their people recovered. A still further advance is found in the weeping prophet, who sees with grief unto tears, and denounces with a sorrowful despair, the evils for which he perceives no remedy. But the true reformer cannot stop with these. He may combine all these elements—righteous wrath, sharp denunciation, heartbreaking grief, and manifest sympathy for his sinning people—but he must be more and do more than all that is here implied, or he cannot lead and ensure the reformation for which he prays.

That completing element lies in the assumption of leadership and its summons for a following. Some brave, even if hitherto obscure, and modest Gideon must blow his trumpet and summon a following of his brethren. He must say that this task can be done, must be done, and we are the men and this the hour to do it. Here is the confident call of leadership in a righteous cause, a cause believed in, a cause whose ultimate triumph is really hoped for, a cause in which the leaders are willing not only to dare but to do, and not only to do, but, if need be, to die.

Partiotism and philanthropy have furnished many illustrious examples of this spirit, but it is not claiming too much for the Christian ministry to say that in its ranks in all ages reformers of the true and noblest type are to be found. In the age of which we now treat lived Wiclif, Huss and Savonarola. These were no gay satirists of follies which they blithely shared, no blatant censors of sins which they indulged, no sharp antagonists of evils which they fought only with pen and tongue, no gloomy prophets of calamities against which they lifted warning voices merely, not helping hands. Nor were these immortal three alone. Brethren and followers they had, even if comparatively few; and, though the work was too great for them, it was nobly begun and found a larger accomplishment in after times.

In their call to the consciences of men—that residue of moral force which even decay and darkness cannot utterly smother in human society—these reforming preachers had a mighty engine of power and a perpetual incentive to hope. But for the Christian preacher this was not, and never is, enough. He must be more than the moral reformer, while he always must be that. There is for him a higher appeal than to the awakened conscience and the earnest coöperation of men of like mind with himself. The chief element, nay, the real essence, of a religious reformation is its appeal to God. This was the distinctive thing in the work of the great reformers of the sixteenth century, and of those few brave spirits who preceded them in the dark fourteenth and fifteenth.

By what higher warrant than that of human conscience and law may men assail existing evils and call on other men to aid in attacking and overcoming them? Some might say that no higher warrant is needed; but the Christian reformer does not so speak, and history justifies his resort to an authority supreme over these. But what shall be the character of his appeal to God? That leads us to a deeper question. How is the divine authority expressed for men? To what visible and accessible manifestations of the divine will shall resort be made? The question is put in this speculative form only to make clearer the facts with which we are dealing. In its historical form it is simply this: How did the reform preach-

ers of the corrupt age which we are studying make their appeal to God?

The three ways in which God is believed among Christians to indicate his will were all more or less clearly invoked in the reformatory struggles of our period. To some God spoke most distinctly in the consciousness and conscience of the pious and enlightened soul. The dealings of the divine Spirit with devout individuals in their sought and practised communings with God were accepted and utilized as revelations of his mind and will. The real element of truth and strength that is here involved should be frankly recognized. But we see that this mystic strain lapsed only too easily into a belief of direct personal inspiration, and even in so noble a soul as Savonarola went perilously near to fanaticism and ended in comparative failure. This mode of appeal needed, as it ever does, the correction and regulation of something external, stable and definite.

To others God spoke in the church and all its institutions, as the historic and visible manifestation of his presence among men. And while in its human developments there might arise errors in life and doctrine, it is for the church to purify itself in head and members. The appeal must be from the church corrupted to the church aroused to its fallen state. Again, whatever force must be allowed to the idea of common consent in doctrine, as tending to orthodoxy, and to general agreement in morals, as tending to righteousness, shall here also be freely conceded. But varying standards, both theoretically and historically, tend to confusion; and, as a matter of fact, the Catholic Church failed to effect its own reformation. Partly because the real advocates of reform were in a minority and not even then unanimous, and partly because the church and its theology contained many errors that could not be removed without what was tantamount to abdication of some of its strongest claims, thorough reform in this direction was hopeless. Constance and Basel glaringly record this failure, and Trent later emphasized and perpetuated it.

Something more was needed. Accordingly, others sought and found the finally authoritative voice of God in the Holy Scriptures. If the individual Christian ex-

perience and the churchly life and doctrine conformed to the Bible they might—always with caution and open to revision and correction—be accepted as subsidiary aids in reaching right conclusions and effecting needed reforms; but evermore and finally the revealed Word of God in Holy Scripture must be supreme authority. Here Wiclif and others laid down the gage of battle; it was on this field they fought and fell, that later reformers might here also fight and triumph.

Historic justice, however, requires that two remarks should here be made as to the use of Scripture by the early reform preachers. One is that they were not absolutely alone in their appeal to the Bible and in their use of it. Others also recognized the Scriptures as authority, but not with the emphasis and finality that make this the distinctive and triumphant thing in reformatory preaching. The other remark is that so deeply seated and universally accepted were false principles of interpretation and application in the pulpit use of Scripture, that even the reformers themselves were by no means clear of them. But it is their glory that here also they made a notable advance and prepared the way for better things.

In the old Teutonic stories the hero, Siegfried, had to take the rusted fragments of his inherited sword and by file and fire and hammer make it over again before it became in his strong hand the ever-victorious weapon of assault upon dragons and all other foes. So the Siegfried of reform must forge anew the sword of the Spirit that out of the rust and breakage of centuries of misuse it might come forth a keen and gleaming blade, ready to hand in every fight for the truth. To some of the heroes thus armed and active, thought not, alas! immediately victorious, we shall give our attention in the next chapter.

CHAPTER X

PREACHERS OF THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

Having discussed in the preceding chapter the times and the preaching that characterized them, we must now

consider some of the representative preachers of the various tendencies of thought and methods of work. The older types remained and the preachers of reform—advance heralds of the Reformation—deserve and will receive special study.

I. PREACHERS OF THE OLDER TYPES

Italy was specially rich in scholastic and popular preachers in the fifteenth century;¹ but only a few of the best can be noticed here. John (Giovanni) of Capistrano (1385-1456) was a Franciscan of the stricter sort. He was a man of some learning and highly regarded in his native land as a preacher. He so distinguished himself by his zeal against heretics that the pope sent him on a mission to Germany, where he had great crowds. Though he preached in Italian and through an interpreter, his lively gesticulation and theatrical manners produced a great effect on his hearers. He likewise preached in Bohemia against the Hussites.²

Of far greater importance was Bernardino of Siena (1380-1444), likewise a Franciscan, and soon after his death enrolled among the saints. He came of good family in Etruria and enjoyed good instruction, studying canon law. But soon he divided his wealth among the poor and entered the Franciscan order. He was much grieved over the decay in that famous body, and made efforts at reform among them. As an officer of the order he made a journey to Jerusalem, which he turned to good account in his studies. He developed great talent as a speaker and was very popular. Siena was the principal scene of his labors. He was very diligent in preaching, attracted large crowds, and produced wonderful effects. He was especially successful in attacking gambling, many players being induced to forsake the evil and burn their dice and cups. The story goes that a painter complained to Bernardino that his living was

¹I have had excellent help in the following pages from the works of Marenco and Zanotto, and from Rothe; also from the old but still valuable work of Ammon, *Geschichte der Homiletik*, which treats especially of the period between Huss and Luther. Rothe borrowed very freely from this work.

²See Hering, *Geschichte der Predigt*, S. 80.

taken away because he earned his bread by painting dice, and that the preacher told him to paint instead a disc representing the sun with the name of Jesus in the center. The painter did as he was told, and the demand for these tokens grew so great by Bernardino's influence that the painter got rich. The explanation lies in the fact that in preaching Bernardino would sometimes use one of these pictures to illustrate his sermon and heighten the effect. Thus we see a bit of sensationalism and a tincture of superstition in his work. He carried it so far that the pope put a stop to it as approaching idolatry. The sermons of Bernardino are decidedly of the scholastic type—long, exhaustive, with subtle and numerous divisions and distinctions—and one wonders at their popularity. But he had the oratorical talent—imagination and capacity for kindling emotion—and he powerfully moved the people. He treated moral subjects with good effect, and was far superior to most of his contemporaries.

Even more scholastic than he was Leonardo of Utino (d. 1470), who about the year 1444 was a renowned professor at Bologna and preacher also at the court of Pope Eugenius IV. He was a Dominican and enjoyed great reputation as preacher in many cities of Italy. The sermons which remain from him are remarkable, besides their generally scholastic type, especially for two things: their marvellous learning, and the rigid monotony of their structure. In regard to the first Ammon says,¹ "Every one of these sermons is overloaded with an immense mass of sayings and citations from authors of ancient and more recent times. The very first one, on gluttony, contains whole passages from Gregory the Great, Augustine, Seneca, Cicero, Boëthius, Vegetius, Lucan, Ennodius, Gaufred, Valencio, Maximus, Hugo, Isidore, Jerome and Ambrose." In regard to structure it is curious that every discourse is built on the same plan, as monotonously as the chapters of the *Summa* of Aquinas, by which it was evidently influenced. The introduction describes a soul intent on instruction coming to hear the teaching of the Gospel or Epistle, which is stated in the theme, but has to be proved because the

¹ *Op. cit.*, S. 92.

devil would overthrow it. After the introduction and statement of the theme the plan is to unfold the subject under two general divisions represented respectively by Moses and Thomas Aquinas. Each of these general heads is subdivided into four parts. Under the teaching of Moses the subject is tested by, 1, Natural law; 2, divine law; 3, prophetic law; 4, human law. Under the teaching of Aquinas it is tested by, 1, Natural law; 2, evangelical law; 3, canon law; 4, ecclesiastical law. With ingenious subtlety, native to a scholastic, he makes all of these prove his point, and concludes his sermon with the sentence: "Then the fully instructed soul gave thanks to God for what it heard from its teachers and went home in peace. Amen." In all the more than eighty sermons this same plan appears. The further subdivisions under the topics of the various kinds of law are very numerous—preferably forty!—and this is where scholastic ingenuity and wealth of learned quotation especially appear. Such a method might well seem destructive of all oratorical effect, but the energy, the earnestness, the natural oratorical talent of the preacher overbore his scholastic pedantry and give him power over his hearers, who could but admire his learning and thoroughness while they felt the force of his native eloquence.

The scholastic method did not lack notable representatives in Germany also.¹ Among these we may first mention John Gritsch (d. c. 1430), of whom little is known save that as a preacher of the Franciscan order he was very celebrated at Basel in the time of the famous council there. An interesting collection of his sermons remains. Like those of Leonardo, they are uniform in plan (though of course not Leonardo's plan), and are loaded with citations from the authorities.² While the structure is too uniform and artificial, it has the virtues of clearness and neatness. Like many other preachers

¹ Besides Ammon and Rothe, the great work of Cruel, which becomes here in its closing sections extremely valuable. It is a pleasure to make parting acknowledgment to a treatise characterized by so great scholarly research and soundness of judgment.

² The following plan, quoted from Ammon, gives a good specimen of Gritsch's manner. The subject is the Transfiguration,

of his time Gritsch makes much use of the classic fables, and is especially fond of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

His method of treating these may be illustrated by an example quoted from Cruel: "When Jupiter, the god of heaven, was informed of the corruption of the whole human race he took counsel with all the gods and determined to destroy all men by a flood. Beforehand, however, he decided to go down to earth in another form and learn by personal observation whether the complaints against men were well grounded. In human form he visited the wicked tyrant Lycaon, who prepared him a bed in his house, but secretly sought to slay him. For this he was changed into a wolf, who now ranges howling in the forests. The truth of the matter is really this: that Jupiter was a king of Crete, who, by his magic arts made his subjects believe that he was a god, and as such he received worship. Now, when many had bound themselves to war with him, he disguised himself, in order to spy out the force of the enemy, and so he came to Arcadia to Lycaon, who received him treacherously and in the night tried to kill him. By stratagem he escaped this danger and drove Lycaon as a punishment from his possessions, so that he was compelled to flee to the woods and live by robbery and plundering, so it could be justly said that he was changed into a wolf. In truth, beloved, now do the godless people of the Jews appear as such a wolf Lycaon. For we know that the supreme Jupiter, the Son of God, by his incarnation, came down personally to visit the Jewish people. The Jews, however, sought in wolfish fashion ever treacherously to slay him. But Christ, who knew all things—

Matt. 17:1 ff, and the outline is as follows:

- I. Mundi utilitas renuntianda: habet enim,
 1. Infidelitatem in acquirendo;
 2. Instabilitatem in retinendo;
 3. Anxietatem in relinquendo.
- II. Humana fragilitas relevanda:
 1. Per secretam inspirationem;
 2. Per uberem largitionem;
 3. Per severam indignationem.
- III. Beatitudinis dignitas desideranda:
 1. In subjectione contra mundi praesumptionem;
 2. In dilectione contra mundi dissensionem;
 3. In duratione contra mundi correptionem.

even their corrupt hearts—could not be deceived, that is, he knew that he by the resurrection would escape the death prepared for him, but that the Jews, on the contrary, for punishment would be scattered, and, like hungry wolves, would range over the earth.” We see here familiarity with classical literature, a rationalizing way of treating the myths so as to prevent their being any more believed as true, an allegorizing way of making them serviceable in Christian teaching, and clear trace of that mediæval hatred of the Jew which was only too much encouraged by the Church and often broke out in shameful persecutions.

The most renowned of these German scholastics was Gabriel Biel (d. 1495), who for a number of years, under the patronage of duke Eberhard of Wurtemberg, filled with distinction the chair of philosophy and theology at the University of Tübingen. In his last years he retired to a home of the Brethren of the Common Life at Schönaue, where he died. Though a busy professor in two departments, Biel was also a diligent preacher. After his death several collections of his sermons were published. They exhibit the extreme of scholastic method, but also deal earnestly and practically with moral and devotional subjects.

Toward the last of the fifteenth century there preached at Leipzig a notable man, George Morgenstern, who attacked in unsparing terms the widespread evils of the age in all classes. He used the dry scholastic method of arrangement, though no doubt with more sap and vigor in actual delivery than appears in the sermons.

After Morgenstern, and early in the sixteenth century, there was one Pelbart, in Hungary, who enjoyed a great reputation among his contemporaries as a preacher of unusual merit. In addition to the scholastic method which characterizes his work there is evidence of some imagination and poetic faculty in his sermons which show therefore traces of real oratorical power.

The popular preachers of the time show a mingling of all the other elements in their discourses. Some join with the scholastic method popular gifts and esteem; some exhibit marked traces of mysticism; and nearly all are given to lamenting or denouncing the current evils

and abuses, and are therefore akin to those who, because of their evangelical method and spirit, are more properly called reformers. We need not, however, complicate our discussion by attending to these distinctions, but simply group by their countries the few selected for treatment.

At least one notable preacher of this popular type came originally from Spain, though he labored chiefly in France, where he died and was buried. He was Vincent Ferrar (1357-1419), born of a respectable and pious family at Valencia in Arragon, pious from childhood, a Dominican in 1374, and soon distinguished as teacher and preacher. From a boy he was in love with preaching and had the natural gifts of an orator. At his earliest appearance during the years of his monastic life, his eloquence attracted wide admiration, and crowds gathered to hear him wherever he went.

Later when he went on his journeys, especially at the head of a band of Flagellants, his following was enormous, and he preached daily. His preaching is said to have produced amazing results, and miraculous powers were attributed to him, as in case of Francis and Antony before him. Like them he was canonized soon after his death. He must have had in a large degree the power of moving discourse, but his published sermons do not bear out his extraordinary reputation, being in the dry scholastic style and deeply imbued with the thought and method of Thomas Aquinas.

In the Italian preachers of the fifteenth century the scholastic tendency was especially marked, but along with this not a few of them displayed unusual powers of popular oratory. Among these, three are specially worthy of mention.

Bernardino of Busti (d. c. 1500) was a Franciscan from Milan and was esteemed by his contemporaries as a preacher of extraordinary merit. Ammon relates that whenever on fast days and special occasions the people of the towns in northern Italy desired a preacher of unusual power they petitioned the Franciscan authorities to send them Fra Bernardino. In scholastic character his discourses resemble, without equalling, those of Leonardo of Utino, and many of them are without any oratorical quality. But, as we have so often had to notice, this

does not disprove the real oratorical power and fervor of the actually delivered sermons.

Contemporary with Bernardino was his fellow Franciscan, Robert Caracciolo of Lecce, who labored mostly in the vicinity of Naples. He was regarded by his contemporaries as a "second Paul," and had the art of moving to tears. That he was not free from sensational methods we have already seen,¹ but he too was capable of serious work along with his scholastic methods and his popular arts. But by far the most famous Italian preacher of this century, next to Savonarola, was the renowned Gabriel Barletta (fl. c. 1470), of whom it was said by way of proverb, *Qui nescit Barlettare, nescit prædicare*—if one doesn't know how to preach like Barletta he doesn't know how to preach at all. He was born at Barletta near Naples, and took his name from his birthplace. As a preacher of the Dominican order he preached in many different places in Italy, but very little is recorded of his life. A curious collection of sermons, or reports of sermons, has come down from him. He undoubtedly must have preached in Italian, but these sermons are reported in barbarous Latin, with frequent interlarding of Italian words and whole phrases. Discourses of this kind are called "maccaroni sermons." They are not infrequent in the French mediæval collections, as Lecoy de la Marche and others tell us, but Barletta's are the only real specimens in Italian. Marenco² thinks that the sermons were certainly delivered in Italian, but that the half-learned reporter gave them in Latin as best he could, but where the Latin was not at hand for phrases or words, he simply gave the Italian. As they stand, therefore, the sermons are curious specimens of reporting and of diction. But beneath their barbarous jargon their method and matter are worthy of note. Scholasticism was in them, to be sure, but the popular note is predominant. The preacher deals in legend and anecdote to a remarkable degree, often descending to the burlesque, the comic, and even the inane and silly. He is a preacher to the crowd, the unenlightened mass that loves entertainment and spice, and is not too particular as to the quality of it either as regards taste

¹ *Ante*, p. 303.

² Cap. I.

or good sense. The vulgar and coarse, as well as the ridiculous and irreverent, are here, but we should do Barletta injustice to suppose that this was all or the main thing in his work. He was an earnest man and used these trifles rather as means than as ends. He spoke with courage and effect against the evils of the time, and did not descend so low with the light and sensational methods as did many of his contemporaries. He knew how to treat with more than usual delicacy and good sense such themes as conjugal love and the dance.¹ Other moral subjects engaged his attention also, and he had the art of speaking to the point, and at the same time to the hearts of his hearers.

There were in France during this epoch a number of preachers of the popular sort, among whom the most notable were Maillard and Menot. Olivier Maillard (fl. c. 1500) was born in Brittany in the fifteenth century and died early in the sixteenth, exact dates being uncertain. He was a Franciscan, a doctor of the Sorbonne, and celebrated as a preacher, especially at the church of St. Jean en Grave at Paris. He also served as court preacher at times both for Louis XI. of France and for the duke of Burgundy. Pope Innocent VIII., King Charles VIII. of France, and Ferdinand of Castile all honored him with commissions of importance, which he discharged with fidelity and skill. In 1501 he was charged by the pope with the hard and thankless task of reforming the Franciscan order in France. He bravely undertook to do what he was told, but was resisted and even chased from one of the monasteries as a false brother. He paid back this debt, however, very richly in his sermons, where he depicted and excoriated the corruptions of his brethren in no sweet fashion.

His reputation is founded principally on a series of sermons which he preached in Paris probably between 1494 and 1508. They were a holy terror. They spared no class, nor person. King, nobles, priests, ladies, and the people generally were attacked with a boldness that is commendable indeed, but with a bitterness of spirit that could not have been edifying, and a coarseness of language that is without excuse even in that age of license.

¹ Examples given in Ammon, S. 131 ff.

The preacher borrowed the language of the lowest—the slang of the streets and the vulgarities of the dissolute.¹ Once the king, Louis XI., was so plainly attacked that on Maillard's language being reported to him he naturally took offence and sent the preacher word that if he went on in that style he should be put into a sack and drowned. Maillard replied, "Go, tell your master that I shall then reach paradise sooner by water than he can with his post-horses." This was an allusion to the fact that Louis XI. had recently introduced post-horses in France. It does not appear either that Maillard changed his course or that Louis executed his threat. No doubt there was exaggeration and excess of invective in Maillard as well as lack of poise and taste, but he meant well, and his boldness and fidelity should not be forgotten, even though his spirit and style cannot be excused.

Contemporary and like-minded with Maillard was his brother Franciscan, Michel Menot (d. 1518), the place and date of whose birth are unknown. He lived in the reigns of Louis XI., Charles VIII., Louis XII., and Francis I. For a long time he taught theology in the Franciscan school at Paris, and died there in 1518. He enjoyed so great a reputation as preacher that he was called *Langue d'Or*, the Golden Tongue. His sermons were taken down by hearers, reported in the barbarous *maccaroni* style of mingled French and (alleged) Latin, printed in many editions. They must, therefore, be taken with some allowances, but as we have them they exceed those of Barletta and Maillard in coarseness and buffoonery. They portray a terrible state of affairs in French society at that time, and are themselves, in spite of good purposes and a courageous spirit, a mournful comment on the religion and taste of the age.

The greatest German preacher of the popular type in this time was John Geiler of Kaisersberg² (1445-1510), who passed most of his active life as preacher in Strasburg. He was born at Schaffhausen, early lost his father and was brought up by his grandparents at

¹ Méray, *op. cit.*, and an art. in the *Nouvelle Biographie Universelle*.

² All the German authorities on the period devote considerable attention to him, but the discussion of Cruel, S. 538 ff, is particularly good, and is mainly followed here.

Kaisersberg, whence his surname. He pursued his studies at Freiburg and became a professor of philosophy there; but soon turned his attention to theology and to preaching. He found his work in the pulpit, and in 1478 accepted a call to Strasburg, where, in the Minster, a preaching office had been endowed without the cares of the priesthood. This suited Geiler exactly, and here he did the most of his work, though at the request of the bishop of Augsburg he spent some time there during 1488-89; and in Strasburg and vicinity he often preached in other churches and in the cloisters. At the cathedral during the summer and festival seasons he was accustomed to preach at six o'clock in the morning, at other churches and in the cloister at three in the afternoon.

Geiler's sermons have come down in various German editions, and as they stand are but imperfect reports of his actual utterances. He wrote out and published none himself, but from his Latin sketches and the notes of hearers these sermons have been worked out. But even thus they show the characteristics of the man and reveal a preacher of no ordinary popular gifts and power. Like his Italian and French contemporaries he descended to the coarse and comic to a considerable degree, and far beyond the bounds of good taste even in that age; like them, also, he attacked with sharp invective and reckless daring the sins of all classes—people, clergy, and rulers. His course made him enemies, who resorted to a number of petty persecutions to spite him—such as employing the choir boys to mock during the service, the writing of abusive and indecent letters, following him with derisive calls and mimicries as he went on the streets, and other annoyances of the sort. But he went on his way unmoved, and he won great favor, attracted large crowds, and secured the friendship and confidence of many men of influence, including the emperor Maximilian, who "wrote to him frequently, received visits from him, heard him preach, and received with kindness and interest certain moral counsels which Geiler gave him—to restore peace, to do equal justice to all, and to put an end to the plunderings that had then gained the upper hand."¹

Though free with his tongue, and not averse to wine

¹ Ammon, S. 219.

and rough jokes, Geiler was otherwise above reproach in his life and earnest and faithful in the discharge of his duties. As a man he was of kindly, frank, accessible disposition; conscious of personal rectitude without pride, and bold in attacking sin without personal grudge or unsympathetic harshness toward the penitent. He was a close observer and had a thorough acquaintance with human nature, and with all the details of life in his time. His illustrations, like those of Beecher and Spurgeon in modern times, are drawn from many sources. Likewise he was a wide reader and well educated, and his sermons show excellent labor put on his preparation. If he lacked the higher degree of originality he at least knew how to make good and individual use of what he learned from others. So there appear in his sermons traces of both scholastic learning and mystic contemplation; but he was above all and chiefly a preacher to the people.

A curious specimen of his work is the series of seven sermons on "The Hare in the Pepper," that is, the seasoned, or spiced, hare. There are two texts for all seven: Lev. 11:6, and (chiefly) Prov. 30:26: "The conies are but a feeble folk, yet make they their houses in the rocks." He compares the Christian to a hare under fourteen points, derived from the habits and fate of that animal, treating one or several of the lessons in each discourse, thus: "1. The hare is timid, so the Christian lives in the fear of God. 2. It is swift in running, so is the spiritual person, swift in good things and finds nothing too hard. 3. It runs quicker up than down the mountain, so the Christian up the mountain of God. 4. Dogs are set upon the hare, so the evil spirits upon us. 5. It rests its safety upon flight, so must we flee before evil assaults. 6. It continually moves its lips and mumbles, so should we continually fear God. 7. It has long ears, so also should the Christian have long ears, in order to hear with diligence and eagerness the word of God. 8. It makes its resting place in the rocks, that is, for us, Christ. 9. The skin of the hare must be removed, so must we lay off a threefold skin: temporal good, our own will, outward works. 10. It is roasted in the fire, so we in sufferings and adversities. 11. It is basted, so

must we baste ourselves with the sauce of God's grace, with devotion and divine love. 12. It must be tested, whether it is well roasted or not, so must we test ourselves. 13. It must be put in the pepper, that is the cloister¹ and all therein which nips and burns our human nature like pepper. So also must persons out in the world lay on themselves many self-denials and penances. 14. The hare is brought on golden plates to the table, so shall we also some time be set before God as a pleasant savor in the heavenly kingdom and be by him consumed and incorporated with himself."

This last thought is worked out thus: "The hare is put into two golden plates and set on the table before the king, where it is received with pleasure and eaten and incorporated with the king and made one with him. So also the believing Christian, when he has been prepared in the way before described, is borne by the hands of the holy angels on the two golden plates of glory—body and soul—into everlasting bliss before the face of the heavenly King. And as the hare is eaten by the king, so thou, through an unspeakable benevolence, love and joy, art sunken in God and made one with him. Not essentially, as the heretic Amalrich said,² but heartily through clear knowledge, love and joy. There is man again in his source, there has he first peace, rest, and bliss, there has the little hare first rightly reached its resting place in the rocks, there its fear has disappeared, its heart flutters no more, it dreads not, for it is safe and knows it is safe. There it experiences what was promised, that God will dry all tears and henceforth there will be neither weeping nor pain. There will come true what the Lord has said, that the humble shall be exalted. The little hare that ran despised here in the vale of tears, was hunted by hellish dogs, flayed and roasted, comes now to great honor."

This gentler strain was not, however, the most characteristic thing in Geiler's work. His "Ship of Fools" and other collections of sermons give forth the sterner, coarser, and less pleasing, but also more vigorous and effective parts of his method. Altogether he is a de-

¹ The sermons were preached in a nunnery.

² Amalrich of Bena, a mystic of the extreme Eckhart school.

cidedly important character in his age, and did something to arouse the German mind preparatory to the Reformation.

Coming to the Netherlands we must go back to an earlier date and place ourselves in the second half of the fourteenth century. Here we find among the popular preachers a man remarkable for his personal piety, his excellent success in preaching, and his abiding influence on the best religious life of the age. It is Gerhard Groot¹ (1349-1384), the noble preacher and the founder of the Brethren of the Common Life. Groot was born of wealthy and excellent family at Deventer, the only son of his parents. He was weakly in body but eager in mind, and received a good education at home, at Paris, at Cologne. Returning home well prepared in culture for the work of a priest, he had no difficulty in finding places for beginning his work, and accepted a subordinate position at Utrecht. Well off and cultured, with a taste for luxury and pleasure, it looked as if he must go the way of the worldly clergy. But soon a deeper life was awakened within him by the influence and pleading of a pious friend whom he had won at Paris, and who visited him at Utrecht, and dealt lovingly and faithfully with him. It is a beautiful incident, creditable alike to both the men. Gerhard changed his course, burnt his costly books on magic, gave up his income, put off his fine clothes for a coarse gray garment, and withdrew for ascetic practices, devotion, and further study to a Carthusian monastery at Gueldres. Here he spent three years, when his active nature drove him forth to live and work among his fellowmen. He shrank from the responsibilities of the priesthood, but was ordained a deacon, and this gave him the right of public instruction by preaching.

In this humble spirit Groot began his wonderful career as a travelling popular preacher. He had pronounced success from the start; for back of his admirable preparation, there lay both the natural talent for public speech and the earnestness of a soul bent on serving God and doing good to men. Thomas à Kempis said of Groot that he worked in the spirit of John the Baptist. People of all classes thronged to hear him, wherever he came, and

¹ Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Ref.*, Bd. II., S. 54 ff.

he called them to repentance and faith. It was not only his eloquence and earnestness of speech that drew them, but men saw and felt the power of his blameless and consecrated life. He refused pay for his services, and sought no ecclesiastical preferment. It was said of him—precious eulogium upon a preacher—*Fecit quod dixit; sicut docuit, quoque vixit*. He sought to know the experiences of the people and to adapt his preaching to their needs, and he preached in the popular tongue. His zeal was unwearied, the fruits of his labors rich in conversions and real amendment of life.

But his success and his rebukes made him enemies among the worldly clergy, whose vices he knew and denounced, and by their representations he was deprived of his permission to preach. Friends laid the case before the pope, but the appeal was in vain. Groot submitted to the authority of his ecclesiastical superiors and gave up preaching, but turned his attention to teaching unofficially and quietly among the people. Here also his success was great. A visit to the aged mystic, John Ruysbroek, at his abbey near Brussels, impressed Groot not only with the beauty of the mystical life, but also with the orderly and peaceful way in which the monks lived together. He came away with the idea in his mind that pious men without monastic vows might live in common to learn and teach. His views found acceptance with friends, and so arose the Brethren of the Common Life, a sort of pious society for mutual edification, which speedily concerned itself with the education of the poor. The brotherhood grew and extended, and many a poor scholar—Erasmus among them, and John Wessel—afterwards received instruction in early life in the schools of this society. Busied with his order, and his teaching, Groot died in the midst of his years and his usefulness—having caught the plague from visiting a sick friend—when only thirty-four years of age. His sermons do not seem to have been reported and preserved, but the influence of his life and of his brotherhood was great in producing other preachers of evangelical tendency and in preparing the way for the Reformation.

1 In England as in the Netherlands and generally in Germany, the popular preaching was characterized by a more

seriously reformatory spirit than was the case in Italy and France. Wiclif and his preachers, and afterwards the Lollards, did the most of this work; but they come more naturally under the reformatory preachers.

The mystic preachers of the period are naturally fewer in number than those of the other types, but some of them were very notable and influential men. The geographical happens here to be also the chronological order, and we have to do with only three countries—the Netherlands, France, Germany.

The earliest important representative of mysticism in the Netherlands was John of Ruysbroek¹ (1293-1381), who was born at a village from which he took his surname, near Brussels, late in the thirteenth century. He lived to a great age, reaching over to the latter part of the fourteenth century. He was much influenced by Tauler. At eleven years of age he was put to school at Brussels, where he studied four years. Nothing is recorded of any further schooling, and through life he was more devoted to piety than to learning. At twenty-four years of age he was ordained a priest and appointed to a church in Brussels. He was often seen sunk in deep meditation in the streets, not noticing the crowd. But in his teaching he warned against mere ecstatic mysticism and contended for a deep inward piety. Up to his sixtieth year he exercised the priest's office in Brussels with fidelity, but not much is known of the character and effect of his preaching. But the attractiveness of the contemplative life so grew upon him that he retired about 1363 to a newly founded Augustinian cloister near Brussels, where he spent the remainder of his long and peaceful life. Here he gave himself to meditation and writing and to instructing the many who came to learn from the pious old man the life of self-denial and love to God. Among these visitors, as we have seen, was Gerhard Groot. Ruysbroek's writings reveal a mysticism less profound than Eckhart's, less practical than Tauler's, but he had some affinities with both, without being so great as either. In preaching and teaching as well as by personal character, he made his mysticism profoundly and fruitfully influential upon others, and his work was one

¹ Ullmann gives also a good account of Ruysbroek.

of those far-off but important steps which led to the reform preaching and life in later years.

Gerhard Groot has already been noticed among the popular preachers, but he belongs here also, as he had decidedly mystical traits; and he also claims mention here as a necessary connecting link between Ruysbroek and the other great Netherlands mystic who has filled the Christian world with the odor of sanctity in his famous writing—*The Imitation of Christ*.

Thomas à Kempis (1380-1471) was born of humble and hard-working parents at a little Dutch village not very far from Cologne, called Kempen, from which his surname is taken. The family name was Hamerken, but the other is so well established that it has usurped the place of a surname. The boy early showed both intelligence and piety and was glad to avail himself of the free education offered to poor children by the Brethren of the Common Life. After having been aided for a time by their funds he entered their house at Deventer. Here a congenial friend, and the excellent head of the school, Florentius, successor to Groot, both had great influence on the youth, and he was drawn to the life of contemplative piety. After several years he was advised by Florentius that if he desired to lead the contemplative life he should enter a monastery. This delighted Thomas, and he soon entered the Augustinian convent of St. Agnes near Zwoll. For five years he remained a novice, then was made priest, and later superior. Here his life flowed quietly on to its end at the age of more than ninety years. Exercises of devotion, writing and copying, reading, preaching, and exhorting the novices, the brethren and many visitors who came to hear him, occupied his time. Many of his sermons remain, and they exhibit the sweet restfulness, the purity, the love, the quiet devoutness that we would expect from the author of the *Imitation of Christ*.¹ Thomas à Kempis was a thoroughgoing Catholic and monk, and his views are not by any means all

¹ The question of the authorship of this gem of devotional literature cannot be regarded as settled beyond doubt, but the better opinion among critics seems to be that which I heard Prof. Hauck of Leipzig express in a lecture, namely, that the claims of Thomas are the best, and that if not his, the work must be regarded as anonymous.

sound or evangelical, but he was mystical, pious, devoted. His influence was all in favor of purity and reform within the church, and the total effect of his life and work has been sweet and helpful.

In France we find a practical mystic in the famous chancellor of the University of Paris, Jean Charlier (1363 1429), who was born at a little place called Gerson, near Rheims, and, like so many others, is called from his birthplace rather than by his family name. He was educated at the University of Paris, and in 1408 was pastor of one of the leading churches there. His view of preaching is set forth in a passage¹ from one of his sermons: "Many believe that sermons should be delivered only that the people may learn and know something that they did not know before. Hence their scornful saying, 'What is preaching to me? I already know more good than I am willing to do.' But these people are in error; for sermons are not delivered for this reason only, that one may learn something, but also for this reason, to move the heart and inclination so that they shall love, desire, and accomplish that which is good. Therefore the apostle desires not so much that one should learn what is in Christ as that he should be likeminded with him. They, however, who attend sermons only to learn something new are like those of whom the apostle writes that they are ever learning and yet know nothing." In his preaching Gerson boldly and decidedly attacked abuses and degeneracy, especially in the ignorant, worldly, and greedy clergy. He had accurate knowledge of human nature, a keen observation, and much experience of men and things. A Catholic critic² says of him that he had "quickness of comprehension, penetration of judgment, rich experience and blooming fancy, extensive reading in ancient classics, solid rhetorical structure, fundamental knowledge of philosophy and theology. Further he had an admirable familiarity with the Holy Scripture." This is high praise, but it has to be discounted by the fact that Gerson did not rise above the scholastic and allegorizing methods current in his day. And the moral quality of his work, high as it undoubtedly is, must also

¹ Quoted by Rothe, S. 300.

² Art. in Wezter und Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*.

be painfully discounted by the pettiness and casuistry he displays in treating certain questions.¹

Gerson was active at the Council of Constance, and boldly sided with the progressive party there in holding that the council was superior to the pope and had the right to depose the three claimants and elect a new pope. Having denounced the murder of the Duke of Orleans, he became unacceptable to the court in France and could not return there. He first found a refuge in Austria, but later went to Lyons and lived there in a convent of which his brother was prior, occupying himself in his later years in teaching little children. He was among the most influential ecclesiastics and preachers of his time, and his own life was above reproach.

It would be strange if in Germany no trace of mysticism should be found among the preachers of this epoch, and doubtless there was more of it than comes to the surface or renders itself conspicuous. For, as a matter of fact, no specially distinguished mystical preacher appears among the Germans of the time. There are two men, however, who though not of the highest rank as either preachers or thinkers claim at least brief notice.

John Veghe² (d. 1504) was the son of a citizen of Münster, and is mentioned in 1451 as a member of the Münster house of the Brethren of the Common Life. He was advanced to the position of rector, and in 1481 was made rector of the Sisters' house at Niesink. His "collations," in the low German dialect, have been published and favorably noticed by several German critics. From these notices it is gathered that Veghe did not adhere closely to the scholastic form in preaching, though he was fond of making a series of "points." He made a rather practical use of some of Eckhart's ideas, and in one place there is a clear and bold utterance against the abuse of indulgences. The sermons have the Catholic contents, leaning much on Augustine, but with a practical mysticism, which though below the measure of Thomas à Kempis, is yet rather in his vein. They show also

¹ Quite a list—and a very unedifying one—is given by Ammon, S. 70 ff. Among other things he defends the not uncommon but no less astounding theory that a monk's vow of chastity would be broken by marriage, but not by occasional sensual indulgence.

² Hering, *Gesch. der Pred.*, S. 83.

warmth, devotion, elevation, and purity of spirit characteristic of the better type of mystical preaching.

The other representative mystic is the better known and highly esteemed John Staupitz (d. 1524), who, though not very strong as a preacher, yet by his piety, his personal influence, and most of all by his relations to Luther, occupies an important place in the early history of the Reformation. The place and date of his birth are unknown, and nothing definite of his parentage is recorded, except that he was of good family in Meissen. He was educated at Leipzig and Tübingen, where he received his doctor's degree, and was prior of an Augustinian monastery. Later he was made vicar-general of this order, and was appointed by Frederick the Wise professor in the newly founded university at Wittenberg. On a visit to Erfurt he met the young Martin Luther, then much troubled with doubts and fears, and took a warm interest in the young monk. He pointed Luther to Christ alone as the ground of hope, interested himself in his promotion to Wittenberg, and was at first warmly sympathetic with his attack upon the abuses in the church. But Luther went too fast and too far for Staupitz, who never gave up his Catholic views or connection, though he was favorable to reform within the church. Later Staupitz transferred from the Augustinian to the Benedictine order and spent his latter years chiefly in southern Germany, where he died in 1524.

As a preacher Staupitz had no preëminence of talent; but was heard with interest and profit. He held the mystical doctrine of the union with Christ by losing self in him through contemplation. He was not at all an original thinker in any line. But he is chiefly memorable to Protestants because of his helpful friendship to Luther in the early formative stage of the great reformer's career, and is more notable for the purity and piety of his life than for high intellectual achievements of any kind.

In general, these mystics are an important link in the chain of influences connecting the Reformation with the more evangelical types of life which existed and persisted through the dark times of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

2. THE PREACHERS OF REFORM

The history of preaching has already often shown us that in the times of its highest prosperity the things that make for decline are ever present and active, and that in the times of its lowest depression the forces of reform and purification are never wholly absent. In these two centuries of comparative decline which intervened between the great Catholic revival of preaching in the thirteenth century, and the greater Protestant revival which glorified the first half of the sixteenth, the better elements of preaching were not entirely lacking, and the forces were slowly gathering which out of the corrupted mass of mediæval decay were to produce the great evangelical preaching of the Reformation. So we study some of the reform preachers, beginning with those in the far West.

Up to this time England has played no great part in the history of preaching. She has had preachers among her priests and monks, but none of extraordinary merit or wide reputation. But now she furnishes to the world the "Morning Star of the Reformation," and with the beginning of that tendency enters upon a glorious career in this as in other departments of history. From now on her preachers rank with the first in respect of character, power, and enduring fame.

The great preacher and reform leader, John Wiclif¹ (1320-1384), was born about the year 1320 of good family near Richmond in Yorkshire. The social standing of his people was excellent, and they probably had some means. The boy received good education and was early sent to Oxford, where he distinguished himself successively as student, scholar, teacher, and preacher. Oxford was henceforth the center and principal scene of his life and work. Wiclif's career as a preacher began in 1361, when he was ordained to the priesthood. Immediately his preaching and writings began to attract attention, for his word was with power. He held various places as a preacher while residing, studying, lecturing, and writing at Oxford.

In 1374 the king appointed him to the parish of Lutter-

¹ The surname seems to be local, as was so often the case, and to denote a cliff of the river Wye—Wye-cliff—shortened to Wiclif. Among the variety of spellings the simplest one is adopted in the text.

worth, and he held this place to his death. With it his name is inseparably associated, for here he did the most of his work, as priest and preacher, though living chiefly at Oxford.

Besides his regular parochial work at Lutterworth Wiclif often preached in other places, and his preaching was very acceptable to the people wherever he went. In London he was heard with great admiration by court and people, but naturally not by the clergy, whose worldliness and unfitness he was already attacking with power. Because of political sympathies he enjoyed the favor of the powerful statesman, John of Gaunt, whose protection was worth much to the reformer in his bold attacks on the clergy and the papacy.

Notwithstanding Wiclif's favor with the court and the people, his clerical enemies finally plucked up courage to call the bold preacher to account for his caustic utterances. In 1377 charges of heresy and other things were brought against him before the Bishop of London. But the trial was broken up by a brawl between his protectors and the bishop's following, and nothing came of it. His enemies then got the pope (Gregory XI.) to issue bulls condemning certain teachings of Wiclif as heretical. The bulls also called for the institution of processes against the reformer. But partly because of the sympathy of the University of Oxford, and partly because the bishops themselves were somewhat jealous of having a papal tribunal to deal with accused persons in England, this effort to crush Wiclif was not successful. Once more, in 1378, he appeared before the prelates in London to answer charges, and again through the sympathy of powerful protectors (John of Gaunt and the Princess of Wales among them) the trial came to little, only a mild reproof being administered to the preacher.

In this same year (1378) Wiclif organized his companies of "poor priests," or "simple priests," as they were called, to go about England preaching; and at the same time he set on foot his translation of the Bible into the English tongue. The far-reaching importance of these two measures cannot be overestimated. The "poor priests" were not an ecclesiastical order—Wiclif had a poor enough opinion of the decayed orders—but were

simply evangelists and colporters of a more scriptural pattern, who went about among the people preaching in English a simple gospel, teaching, and perhaps distributing copies of the Scriptures done into the native language, together with some of Wiclif's writings. Men of character and education were engaged in this work, and the contrast between their voluntary and devoted labors and the pampered and worldly officialism of the endowed clergy, whether secular or regular, was impressive. No wonder the common people heard them gladly; no wonder the pharisaic priests hated the work and its founder. History repeats itself. Good work was done, and in the hearts of the English folk as in a rich soil, seeds were sown that in after years were to bring a great harvest—but alas, only after the harrow had done its work.

Reform principles made progress in Wiclif's own mind. At first he had attacked the papal claims to authority in secular matters, and in other ways. Then he fell upon the evil clergy and spared not their sins and other unfitnesses for their work. At last he comes to assail some of the Roman doctrines, especially that of transubstantiation. His study of Scripture and his acceptance of it as the supreme authority in matters of faith were coming to make of him a reformer indeed. In 1381 he put forth theses against the doctrine of transubstantiation, embodying much the same ideas as those subsequently held by Luther. A treatise called "Wiclif's Little Wicket," which was a tract, but much in sermon form, and no doubt with many ideas and expressions used in his discourses, is given in Fish's *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*,¹ and is a good specimen of the spirit and method of the reformer. It is vigorous in style, bold in expression, and acute in reasoning, and makes a sharp assault on the doctrine of transubstantiation.

This latest phase of his development—attacking certain doctrines of the church—mightily stirred up the already angered clergy, and frightened some of Wiclif's friends. John of Gaunt tried to get him to stop. The trouble was emphasized by the rise of a sedition under John Ball, a popular leader and agitator for the rights of the common people, who claimed to have got his ideas

¹ Vol I., p. 118 ff.

of freedom and popular rights from Wiclif. So a council was called in 1382 to take measures against Wiclif and his followers. Some of these were punished, but Wiclif himself was still left at liberty, though articles from his writings were formally condemned. He had the people on his side, and it was hard to bring him to judgment. Yet he and his friends thought it most prudent for him to retire from Oxford to the more quiet retreat of Lutterworth. Here he pursued his parochial duties and busied himself with his writings for his few years more of life. His health, never strong, was now declining, and he died of a paralytic stroke on the last day of December, 1384.

Apart from his vast importance as a reformer, Wiclif would claim attention alone by his eminent merits as a preacher. Sermons from him have come down to us partly in Latin and partly in English.¹ The sermons are based on Scripture, are not wholly free from scholasticism, nor from the current allegorical method of interpretation, nor from some Roman Catholic errors; but they are in the right direction, for they show at least a better interpretation and use of Scripture than was common, and a far more evangelical doctrine. They are vigorous in attack, clever in appeal, and give suggestions of an eloquence which the spoken discourses must have had. For they are but sketches of sermons and were no doubt amplified in delivery. Not only did the author himself amplify them, but the curious directions at the end of many of the short discourses indicate that he intended his "poore preestis" to make free use of the sermons. Thus at the end of the first sermon on the Rich Man and Lazarus, we find the following: "In this Gospel may preestis telle of fals pride of riche men, and of lustful lyf of mighty men of this worlde, and of longe peynes of helle, and joyful blis of hevene, and thus lengthe ther sermoun as the tyme axith." In sermon five we have a good principle of Scripture interpretation thus set forth: "It is noo nede to depe us in this stori more than the gospel tellith, as it is no nede to bisie us what hight Tobies hound. Hold we us apaied on the mesure

¹ The admirable edition by Dr. Thos. Arnold leaves nothing to be desired: *Select English Works of John Wyclif*; edited by Thos. Arnold, Oxford, 1869.

that God hath govun us, and dreeme we not aboute newe pointes that the gospel leveth, for this is a synne of curiouse that harmeth more than profiteth."

A longer extract from the third sermon, founded on Luke 15, will give us an idea of Wiclif's method. The spelling is given in our modern way, though thereby much of the quaint flavor of the original is lost. "In this gospel telleth Christ two parables of comfort, how his people shall be saved allif [although] priests grudge thereagainst, both prelates and religious [i.e., monks], for their pride and covetousness. The story of this gospel telleth how publicans and sinful men were coming to Jesus to hear his lore [teaching]; and he treated them graciously as a good Lord, but scribes and Pharisees grudged against this and blasphemed against Christ, and said he ate with them unlawfully. And this deed may figure things that fall now, sith [since] prelates as scribes and religious [monks] as Pharisees grudge against true priests, members of Christ, that commune with commons, as publicans, and secular lords as sinful men, and say it falleth not to them to know God's law. For they say it so high, so subtle, and so holy that all-only scribes and Pharisees should speak of this law. And these secular prelates may well be cleped [called] scribes, for they, both more or less, write ¹ [i.e., keep account of] the money that they pile [pillage] of the people more busily than they print in their souls the knowing of God's law. And these religious [monks] be Pharisees, for they be divided ² from the common manner of living by their rotten rites, as Pharisees were. Three causes there be why this heavenly leech [physician] received freely these sinful men and ate with them: first, for he would convert them, to the confusion of proud prelates that letted [hindered] the freedom of God's laws to have their course. By this should they meekly know that highness of state maketh not a man evermore better to God. The second cause is that Christ would give his priests in time of grace lore [teaching] and example to do wisely so, and to stand for the freedom of God's law. The third

¹ Play on the word "scribe" from *scribere*, to write.

² Play on the original meaning of the word Pharisee, a separatist.

cause is, for Christ would show his general lordship and saving not only of Jews but of heathen men in divers states. These prelates would fain that all God's law were hanging on them for to spoil [rob] the people; for then would they tell this law and put them to false understanding as [that] they might have more winning [gain] of the people."

These were bold words, and they are a fair sample of Wiclif's fearless assault on monks and seculars. The rest of the sermon proceeds on the view that Christ is the shepherd, the angels are the ninety and nine, mankind is the lost sheep. Christ is "the woman"—the wisdom of God—the ten pieces are God's "reasonable creatures," the tenth and lost piece is man. "The lantern that was lighted is the manhood [incarnation] of Christ, the turning up of the house is changing of states that be made in this world by the manhood of Christ."

We know that Wiclif had many sympathizers and followers not only among the common people but also among the influential and the cultivated. Yet among them is no preacher of special renown whose name stands out pre-eminent like that of the leader himself. To persons of the reform tendency the name of Lollard was applied, probably as a term of reproach, signifying babblers, or praters. It was a custom of these Lollards to expound the Word of God and teach the people the truth of Scripture. That they opposed the papal errors and sought for a better establishment and a greater enlargement of the rights of the people is certainly true, and so far they must have our sympathy and respect; but there is no reason to doubt that with their good there was mingled the ill of extremes, fanaticism, and perhaps sedition. At any rate the Lollards found themselves under the ban of both church and state, and they were persecuted most cruelly. For ten years after Wiclif's death his followers went on preaching among the people, and sowing the seeds of his evangelical doctrine. But the attitude and enactments of the so-called reforming Council of Constance strengthened the enemies of Wiclif, and active measures of persecution were taken against the Lollards. They were repressed, but their opinions were not extirpated. Like those of the "Friends of God" and other

parties on the Continent these teachings had root among the people and waited in good soil for sunshiny weather.

Something more than a hundred years after Wiclif, and on the eve of the great Protestant revolution, there appeared at Oxford another remarkable man, a scholar and preacher, who held and advocated reformatory views. This was John Colet¹ (1466-1519), celebrated as lecturer at Oxford and as dean of St. Paul's cathedral in London.

Colet was born in London in 1466, the eldest son of Sir Henry Colet, a man of wealth and influence. John received his early education at London, but was soon sent to Oxford, where he remained seven years and took his degree. The love of learning was deep within him, and he went abroad to catch the new spirit of learning and to study the Latin and Greek classics. He visited Paris and Italy, got acquainted with Erasmus and other Humanists, and returned to England in 1497 saturated with the Revival of Letters, and an enthusiast for classical culture. But Colet was also a Christian and desired the work of a priest. He was ordained soon after his return to England, settled at Oxford, where he gave without fee a course of expository lectures on the Epistles of Paul, using the Greek text and expounding from that. Not only the novelty but the merit and power of these discourses attracted enthusiastic and cultured audiences. Colet's fame as a preacher spread, he held various charges, with Oxford as a center, and in course of time was made dean of St. Paul's and a doctor of divinity. At St. Paul's he instituted a course of expository sermons which attracted great attention. He also established a divinity lectureship there for week days, and was the founder of the famous classical school connected with St. Paul's.

Colet held decidedly reformatory views. He disapproved of confession and other Romish practices. On this account he was not acceptable to the clergy, was accused of heresy and brought to trial before Bishop Warham, but was acquitted. He pleaded for a reform within

¹ There is an excellent article on Colet in the *Dict. of National Biog.*, based on the more elaborate work of Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers*.

the church on the basis of the New Testament and of the practices of the early Christian centuries, but he was not as thoroughgoing as Luther, nor did he have the dash and vigor of Wiclif. His was the temperament of the scholar rather than that of the general. But his influence and his writings, and especially his work in opening the Word of God, give him a sure place among the early reformers. He was a man of piety and wrote books of devotion, as well as some commentaries and other theological works. His sermons were given, some in Latin and some in English. His ease and effectiveness, clearness and warmth in speech, are attested by those who heard him, but his remaining sermons—as is so often true—do not exhibit the real oratorical power of the man. One of his sermons, delivered before Convocation in February, 1512, is particularly commended as a bold and powerful plea for reform within the church. Colet died just as the Reformation was beginning, in 1519.

In France, as we have seen, the reform movement took the form of satire and invective in such preachers as Maillard and Menot. The position of Gerson was not satisfactory, for though an excellent preacher of mystical opinions and himself a pious man, his reformatory views went no further than in the direction of healing the papal schism. He was the leading man at the Council of Constance which condemned Huss, and he cannot be fairly reckoned among the fore-reformers. Leaving out these three, who have before been noticed, we may mention one man who lived a little before their time. This was Nicole d' Oresme (Nicholas Oresmus, d. 1382), who is celebrated for at least one bold sermon in the direction of reform. He was a man of great learning and probity, who enjoyed the confidence of several kings and held high office in the French church. He was sent on an embassy to the papal court at Avignon in 1363 or 1364, and took occasion, when invited to preach, to deliver a respectful but vigorous message in regard to the evils in the church. He compared the overthrow of Israel to the impending overthrow of the church because of its corruptions. The sermon does not spare the clergy and was a brave and able testimony. But it does not seem

to have produced any good result, and Oresme certainly did not start or lead any reform in France.

In Germany we find two distinct groups of reform preachers whose work very decidedly influenced opinion in their country and helped to prepare the way for the great Reformation.

The more notable of these were the Bohemian reformers, among whom were several preachers of power whose names are worthy of grateful remembrance. First among them was one Conrad of Waldhausen¹ (d. 1369), who flourished about the middle of the fourteenth century. He was an Austrian by birth and lived in several different places before he finally settled at Prague. Here he had great influence through his powerful and Scriptural reform preaching. He blazed the path for his followers by assailing fearlessly the moral corruption of the clergy, their empty and formal conduct of worship, and their wordy and fruitless disputes.

A very interesting character is John Milicz, or Militsch (d. 1374), who was a contemporary and follower of Conrad. He was of Moravian birth, but received his education at Prague and settled there. He studied both law and theology and was appointed archdeacon and preacher. He attacked vigorously the want of discipline among the clergy, and also lifted up his voice in opposition to the Roman practice of withholding the cup from the laity at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. This, as is well known, became one of the leading questions with Huss and his followers in Bohemia. When Milicz saw that his views were unacceptable to his superiors he resigned his archdeaconry and accepted a ministerial office about the church. Not officially, but in a simple conversational way, he continued to teach and preach. He used the native Bohemian tongue and talked in simple heartfelt fashion to the people, and his influence grew fast. He lived on the voluntary offerings of the people, preaching three or four times a day—probably on the streets and squares. He learned the German language so as to address himself to that portion of the population. He was skilled in the Scripture and handled it with effect in his discourses.

¹ Rothe, S. 252; Cruel, S. 615.

After a while he ceased preaching for a season of rest, and meantime determined to go to Rome and deliver at headquarters a message against corruption. He put up a notice on St. Peter's church that he would preach. His audacity could not be tolerated, and he was put in jail for his pains, and on being asked what he intended to preach he called for his Bible, which had been taken away from him, and said that was his sermon. He soon got his release, however, and returned to Prague, where he took up his preaching again with great zeal and effect. He taught young preachers, rescued fallen women, and had great influence among the people. On the death of Conrad, Milicz was appointed preacher in his place, and thus resumed his official ministry. But he did not cease to attack the vices of the clergy and the corruptions of the church in his daily preaching. He was accused of heresy, but was acquitted, and kept on preaching till his death, in 1374. Some of his sermons have come down in Latin sketches, but these of course convey no adequate conception of his power as a preacher in the common tongue.

Another of these early Bohemian reformers was Matthias of Janow (d. 1394), who was born at Prague, but educated at Paris, where he took his degree. On returning to his native city and being ordained he began to preach against the current evils, and to urge that the cup should be administered to laymen as well as priests. In fact, he went so far as actually to dispense the wine to the communicants; but he was forced by authority to desist from this. He was rather quiet in his preaching and did more by personal influence and by his writings. Still he was a preacher of no small ability. One of his best contributions to the cause of reform was that he induced a wealthy layman to build at Prague the Bethlehem Church, where the gospel should be preached to the people in their own tongue. We shall see that this church and this wise provision figured largely in the career of the great reformer whom we come now to discuss.

John Huss¹ (1373-1415) was born of humble parentage at Hussinetz, in Bohemia, in the year 1373, shortly before the death of his strongest precursor, Milicz. He

¹ All the German authorities, especially Ammon, S. 51 ff.

received only an imperfect education in youth, and his scholarship always showed the defect of his early training. As a young man, however, he attended the university at Prague and took his degrees of bachelor and master in the regular course. He was a vigorous thinker and early won and ever maintained high rank as a theologian. He also developed power as a preacher and was soon chosen to succeed a very estimable man as chief preacher at that Bethlehem Church which had been built for the very purpose of having the word preached in the Bohemian tongue. As yet he did not espouse the cause of reform, but preached with such acceptance that he drew large crowds, won the favor of all, including that of the queen, and thus firmly established himself in the confidence and affections of the people. Meantime he continued his connection with the university as lecturer on theology. The University of Prague was the first to be established in the German countries, and, though in Bohemia, was largely attended by German students and chiefly officered and governed by Germans. Huss was a patriot and jealous for his native land. He secured a better representation of Bohemians in the government of the university. This blow to their supremacy angered the Germans, and multitudes of them left—professors and students—and founded, upon invitation of the elector of Saxony, the first genuinely German university at Leipzig in 1409.

But there were not only German students at Prague. Other nationalities were also considerably represented, and among the crowd of foreign students were some Englishmen, attracted in part, as others, by the fame and standing of the university, and in part by the fact that intercourse between the two countries was stimulated at this time by a matrimonial alliance between the royal houses.¹

Some of these English students had come under Wiclif's influence at home, and by their means the views and writings of the great English reformer became known at Prague. Thus some of Wiclif's writings came into the hands of Huss. At first he opposed the English heretic

¹ Richard II. of England had married a Bohemian princess in 1382.

—even with bitterness—but as he read to controvert he was convinced, and soon became a pronounced advocate of Wiclif's opinions.

Huss now began by tongue and pen to attack the papacy and the corruptions of the church. His course astonished his friends and aroused enemies. But once embarked upon it there was no going back, and he became both in courage and ability a worthy follower of his great English master and a worthy predecessor of Luther. His place at least is assured in the ranks of real reformers, for he made the Scriptures the basis of his opposition to the papal perversions and he wavered not, but sealed his testimony at the stake.

The attacks of Huss aroused the church authorities and he was called to account by the archbishop of Prague, who ordered many of his and Wiclif's writings to be burned. Huss justly characterized this as folly, boldly appealed to the pope, and went on his way. But the attention of the pope had already been called to Huss, and he was summoned to appear before the papal court at Rome and answer charges of heresy. This showed him that his appeal was useless and his personal safety would not be secure, so he declined to go. Upon this refusal he was, in 1410, declared a heretic and excommunicated. But he had his following at Prague and kept on his preaching, as both Savonarola and Luther, under similar circumstances, did after him. The new archbishop, however, resorted to stronger measures than his predecessor, and forbade the conduct of all religious services in Prague as long as Huss remained there. This action decided Huss to leave Prague, and he retired to his childhood home at Hussinetz, but still continued to preach, there and at other places as opportunity offered.

In 1414 the emperor Sigismund assembled at Constance the famous council which was to restore peace to the distracted church, rent by schism, disturbed by heresy, defiled by corruption. On the first two points action was taken, the last slightly touched and fatally postponed. In dealing with heresy the council soon proceeded to summon the arch-heretic Huss to appear before it and answer charges as a disturber of the peace of the church. Armed with a letter of protection from the emperor he came.

The sad and disgraceful story is soon told. Huss appeared before the council, explained his views, refused to retract what he held to be the truth, and was condemned to prison and to execution. In open council he exhibited his letter of protection and called on the emperor to acknowledge his signature and seal. Sigismund turned pale and then blushed with shame, but the imperial word was broken on the casuistical plea that it was right to break faith with a heretic.¹ After further imprisonment Huss was led to the stake and bravely died in the flames in the year 1415, just about a century before Luther nailed his famous theses on the palace church at Wittenberg and began the Reformation.

But though dead Huss lived on in his influence and writings. It belongs to general church history to trace the further progress of the Bohemian reformation, its unhappy divisions, its wars and persecutions and defeat. Numerous works of Huss remained, among them some sketches of sermons chiefly in Latin. But these cannot properly convey a satisfactory impression of his manner or power as a preacher before the people. They are poor in all rhetorical respects, bad Latin, dry, too sharply polemic. The probability is that Huss did not have especially oratorical gifts, but in his preaching he carried more weight by the nature of his utterances and by the strength and sincerity of his convictions than by those more pleasing and impressive talents which we call eloquence. But the people loved to hear him, and the history of religion in Bohemia after him is a tribute to his power with men more striking than the imperfect specimens of his sermons that have come down to us.

Mention at least should be made of the noble friend of Huss, Jerome of Prague (d. 1416). He was a knight at the court of the King of Bohemia, a well educated, much travelled, and highly eloquent man. Though not a priest he sometimes informally preached, teaching the views of Wiclif and Huss. Though dissuaded, he accompanied Huss to Constance; but his courage was at

¹ More than a hundred years later, when Luther was arraigned before the diet at Worms, and Charles V. was urged on similar grounds to recall his safe-conduct, that emperor is said to have emphatically refused, saying, "Non erubescam cum Sigismundo antecessore meo."

first not quite equal to the strain put upon it. He tried to get away, but was captured and imprisoned; under stress he renounced the views of the condemned reformers, but ashamed of his weakness he asked for another hearing. In an eloquent address, which has been preserved in a report made by some one who heard it, he renounced his weak renunciation, boldly and ably defended his real sentiments, and met his fate like a man. In 1416 he was burned on the same spot where Huss had died the year before.

Besides Bohemians there were among the Germans themselves some notable preachers of the reformatory order, who helped to prepare the hearts and minds of many of the German people for the great work of Luther and his colaborers. Among these were Jacob of Jüterbogk, John of Goch, Krafft, and others,¹ who not only opposed the general corruptions of the time, but—it is interesting to observe—especially assailed the abuse of indulgences as these had been proclaimed by Capistrano and other papal missionaries in Germany.

Perhaps the most important of these early German opponents of indulgences and the other errors was John Richsrath (d. 1481), commonly called John of Wesel, from his birthplace. He must not be confused with John Wessel, the famous teacher, mystic, and reformer of this time. Of Wesel's parents and early education little or nothing seems to be known, but it is clear that he was an educated man. He came to the University of Erfurt probably about 1440. Later he was made lecturer at Erfurt, and then doctor. He distinguished himself both as professor and preacher, and about 1450 he published a treatise against the reigning theory of indulgences. After this the pope sent Cardinal Cuso to Erfurt to preach and sell indulgences, and still later came the redoubtable Capistrano² on a similar mission. Wesel did not hesitate to oppose them in much the same way that Luther afterwards attacked Tetzel.

After some twenty years' service at Erfurt Wesel was for a short time at Mainz, going later to Worms, where for seventeen years he lived and preached. As a

¹ Ullmann gives, in his well-known work, a full account of all these.

² Above, p. 317.

preacher he took decided ground against all the more glaring corruptions of the times, and based his opposition on the Scriptures and the Augustinian theology. He is thus in many respects clearly a predecessor of Luther. In his preaching he was more brilliant and fierce than prudent, and as a consequence made enemies and provoked persecution. He was accused of heresy, and proceedings were instituted against him in 1479. The trial went against him and he was put in prison, where, in consequence of hardships too severe for his age, he died in 1481. There can be no question that traces of his work and influence at Erfurt and Worms were helpful in the struggle that was now soon to begin in Germany.

In Italy the voice of reform was not wholly still in the early and middle part of the fifteenth century. Here and there preachers of a more serious turn than the generality of priests lifted up their voices against the manifest and fearful demoralization of the times, and men like Bernardino of Siena and Gabriel Barletta spared not in their denunciations of evil present and ruin to come. But all smaller figures are dwarfed by the eminent greatness of one who, toward the close of the fifteenth century, did a work and made for himself a name as preacher that shall endure through time.

Girolamo (Jerome) Savonarola¹ was born at Ferrara in north Italy, September 21, 1452. His family were respectable and cultivated people. The boy was of a thoughtful, melancholy temperament, and while yet a youth began to think and brood upon the evils of the age. A bright vision of love crossed his path, but the maiden he sought rejected his addresses, and this disappointment increased his melancholy. Like John Chrysostom, he was repelled instead of attracted by the dissolute life of the world in which he lived, and kept himself through life austere and pure.

¹ The standard work on Savonarola is Prof. P. Villari's admirable *Life and Times of Savonarola*, well translated into English by the author's wife. It contains numerous selections from Savonarola's sermons. An edition of these by Baccini has been found useful. There are interesting studies of Savonarola in Mrs. Oliphant's *Makers of Florence*, Mr. W. D. Howells' *Tuscan Cities*, and in George Eliot's *Romola*, which also gives a very vivid sketch of the times.

In his twenty-second year he heard a sermon on the evils of the times and the need of escaping them. This chimed in with his own mood, and he determined to embrace the monastic life. But his entrance into the cloister was not managed in a way wholly to his credit. One day while the rest of the family had gone off to a festival Girolamo left his home, and, going to Bologna, entered the Dominican monastery there. He wrote back to his father an affectionate letter and explained that he had taken that course to avoid the discussion of the matter in the family, as he feared their pleadings might hinder the accomplishment of his resolution.

As a novice and student in the Order of Preachers Savonarola showed great earnestness and diligence both in study and in pious exercises. For seven years the young monk pursued his studies and his self-discipline at Bologna, and then the authorities sent him forth to begin his career as a preacher.

He began at his native Ferrara, but not with much success. He was then sent—in the same year, 1481—to Florence to teach in the famous convent of San Marco and to fill an appointment as preacher in the old church of San Lorenzo.¹ The church was, and even yet remains, an important one in Florence, and the appointment meant recognition of Savonarola's powers. But the series of sermons was a failure. The Florentines did not take kindly at first to the young monk's matter or style, and the audience dwindled to twenty-five perfunctory hearers. A few years were to work a mighty change.

After this Savonarola was sent to other places to preach. During one of his tours in north Italy, preaching much at Brescia, he grew in power before the people. Already he had found the keynote of his future deliverances, the three famous prophecies that henceforth constituted the burden of his message: (1) The church

¹ It is said to be the most ancient church in Florence, having been built in 390, and consecrated by Ambrose of Milan in 393. In Savonarola's time it had been already twice rebuilt, but on the same site and no doubt with some parts of the walls and perhaps other material remaining. Two old pulpits—apparently not now in use—decorated with fine bronze reliefs by Donatello still stand in the church, but whether they were used by Savonarola or not I do not know.

will be scourged; (2) it will be renewed; (3) all will come quickly. His preaching made a great sensation, and the country began to ring with his name and his prophecies. Meantime a chapter of the Dominican order had been held at Reggio, and at this meeting Savonarola had delivered a powerful discourse on his favorite theme. Among the hearers of this speech was that youthful prodigy of learning and piety, John Pico, Count of Mirandola. His admiration for Savonarola became warm friendship. On his return to Florence he had much to tell Lorenzo concerning the eloquence of Savonarola; and the worldly tyrant, who, with all his vices, wished the city to have the best of everything, requested the Dominican authorities to send Fra Girolamo to Florence.

Accordingly, in 1487, Savonarola comes back to the scene of his early failure; but he comes now with a consciousness of power derived from an assured conviction of his mission and from success in other fields, and moreover with such prestige as the admiration of Pico and the patronage of Lorenzo the Magnificent could give. As prior of the convent of San Marco, and preacher in the church attached to the cloister, the austere Dominican finds his work. His attitude toward Lorenzo was uncompromising from the first. He refused to flatter the brilliant and dissolute master of Florence, or in anywise to court or value his patronage. He did not mince his words when speaking of the evils in the city, and he was from first to last the friend of popular government and the foe of the Medicean tyranny. Savonarola's audiences soon overflowed the little church of San Marco, and in the Lent season of 1491 the preacher gave his sermons in the magnificent church of Santa Maria del Fiore (St. Mary of the Flower), otherwise known as the Duomo, or Cathedral, of Florence. In this spacious building thronging multitudes pressed together and stood to hear the powerful eloquence of this Dominican friar. One wonders how he could have made himself heard, but the testimony of witnesses is decisive of the fact.

On the death of Lorenzo the Magnificent, inspired to patriotism by Savonarola's preaching, Florence expelled his son Piero and reestablished the republic. The new constitution, modelled after that of Venice, was largely

formed and adopted by Savonarola's advice and influence. But he was far from being a scheming politician. He bravely and conscientiously sought by his preaching and his personal influence to reform the morals as well as the government of Florence. Personally pure, but inclined to austerity and melancholy, he was too extreme and impracticable in some of his proposed measures. But for a while it looked as if Florence would purge herself from worldly folly and be what the patriot preacher wished—a city where Christ reigned.

As always in republican governments, factions were formed in the city and party spirit ran high. There was, first, the party that favored Savonarola's ideas of government and reform; next, the opposite party, who violently strove against reform; and lastly, a less pronounced party of opposition to the rigorism of Savonarola, who might easily be made to work with the extremists upon occasion. Along with these was a small party of older citizens, friends of the Medici, who desired the return of that family, and bided their time, working with any of the others as suited their views. This political magazine only needed a spark to explode it. The spark fell. Piero di Medici made an attempt to get back into Florence. It failed, but some prominent citizens suspected of favoring his designs were burned to death by the reform party then in power, and this awakened the fierce enmities of the opposition. This was one step toward Savonarola's fall.

We must also take account of the enemies he had in the church. Since the main element of Savonarola's preaching was that which dealt with the existing decay in church and world, it was inevitable that his attack on evil should expose him to the hatred of the corrupt clergy. And two particular circumstances emphasized this general state of affairs. These were the rivalry of the Franciscan order, who were jealous of the pre-eminence of a Dominican; and the character of the man who from 1492 to 1503 occupied and disgraced the papal chair. This man was the infamous Roderigo Borgia, who reigned as Pope Alexander VI. It was not to be expected that a pope whose own life was an epitome of the worst vices of the age should look with satisfaction

upon any effort to reform the clergy, or hear with patience the unflinching exposure and predicted scourging of the evils which afflicted the church. Some of Savonarola's utterances were reported to the pope, perhaps exaggerated and perverted—though they did not require such editing in order to excite the wrath of his unholiness—and he determined to silence the bold preacher. Various means were resorted to without avail. Once the pope invited Savonarola to Rome to confer on these matters, but Fra Girolamo was quite too wise to accept the invitation. Another time, it is said, Alexander offered the monk a cardinal's hat if he would change his course, and Savonarola replied that the only red hat he expected to wear was that of martyrdom. This may or may not be strictly true, but it is at least characteristic. Then the pope resorted to sterner measures. He commanded silence; but the Florentine government, being then in the hands of Savonarola's party, sustained the preacher. The pope then threatened the Florentine merchants in Rome with confiscation of goods. The Seignory felt the force of this argument and counselled the friar to cease preaching for a while. He obeyed; but could not—for many reasons—long remain silent, and in 1496 ascended the pulpit of St. Mark's once more, and in a series of bold sermons went on his way. This introduced the final scene. The pope excommunicated Savonarola and commanded all the clergy and good Catholics to sustain the penalty. At first the government braved the pope and still permitted Savonarola to preach, but it was an unequal fight, and as the friar's enemies in the city constantly gained ground the end was coming into view. This clerical and papal hostility was the second step toward the catastrophe.

The third and fatal cause which coöperated all along and finally precipitated Savonarola's downfall was the indiscretion of himself and his friends. Savonarola was not a man of the same make with Wiclif, Huss or Luther. In both strength of character and soundness of judgment he stands below all of these. And he made the fatal error, which these did not make, of basing his reformatory efforts on the general appeal to conscience and on his own commission as a prophet, rather

than upon the Word of God. That, at moments of high ecstasy, and especially when borne along by the torrent of his own oratorical feeling, Savonarola believed he was preëminently inspired of God is no doubt true. That, in moments of depression, he doubted this, is perhaps equally true. As to the people, there were partisans of his who believed in his inspiration more fully perhaps than he did himself, and there were enemies who believed him a cheat. Between them, and of all grades, was the changeable crowd who could be led either way, according to circumstances. And thus came the end.

Among Savonarola's partisans was a certain Fra Domenico, who during the time that Savonarola was not preaching delivered a series of sermons, in which he went to great lengths in attacking the clergy and in asserting his prior's prophetic claims. He declared again and again that he was prepared to test the truth of those claims by the ordeal of fire. That is, he was willing to walk through fire along with one who opposed the claims in the belief that by a miracle he would come safely through while the opponent would perish. This bravado was finally taken up by the Franciscans, and one of their lay brethren was found who said he would accept the challenge and walk through the fire with Fra Domenico. He expected to be burned, but declared he was willing to suffer if he could thereby expose the false pretensions of Savonarola and his party. Alas! for the weaknesses of the great and good; it is the one serious blot on Savonarola that he consented to this wretched business. His compliance can doubtless be psychologically explained, but it cannot be ethically excused. It is to the shame of the city authorities that they permitted the trial to be attempted, and ordered the necessary preparations to be made in the famous square of the Seignory. Here the fuel was laid and the fires even lighted on the appointed day, in the presence of a great mixed and expectant crowd. When the champions and their partisans, including Savonarola himself, appeared, there was discussion first as to whether the men should go through with their clothes on; and, secondly, whether Fra Domenico should be allowed to carry a crucifix in his hand. These arguments occupied nearly the whole day, and in the

evening a shower of rain came and put out the fire. At last the Seignory asserted the authority they ought to have used at first and forbade the trial, ordering Savonarola and his monks home. Thus the whole thing ended in a fiasco. The people, disappointed, weary, deceived, turned like hounds upon Savonarola and his friends. The mob raged through the city, and only under protection could Savonarola reach San Marco in safety as he retired from the square.

In the following weeks the tragedy ended. The government was now in the hands of the faction opposed to Savonarola, the pope and clergy were bent on his destruction, and the fatal mistake of the ordeal, and its failure, had discredited his highest claims. In vain did the preacher try to explain and justify the recent events. His last sermon was preached in San Marco in March, 1498, and in it he pathetically expressed his willingness to die for his faults. A mob assailed the convent of San Marco, which was vigorously defended by the monks, and the preacher was held responsible for the riot. Savonarola, Fra Domenico and another of his more zealous partisans were arrested and tried before a tribunal partly civil and partly ecclesiastical. The charges against them were really not worthy of serious consideration—charges of sedition in the city, deceiving the people, and heresy. But their destruction was a foregone conclusion, and what with torture and perversion, and even falsification of testimony, the case was made out, and the three men sentenced to be hanged and burned on the very spot in the Piazza della Signoria where the fires had been lit for the ordeal. Here, on the 23d of May, 1498, the abominable sentence was executed. The old palace of the Seignory still looks down grimly on the scene, and the spot is now marked by a bronze plate, which represents the well-known features of the reformer in his monk's cowl, with a palm leaf, and an inscription which tells that after four hundred years Florence placed this memorial tablet in honor of the prophet and preacher who had there suffered for his work's sake.

As a man Savonarola was pure and pious from childhood and through life. Not even his bitterest enemies could attack him here. His disposition inclined to mel-

ancholy and austerity—a part of the hair shirt he wore next his flesh is still shown in his cell at San Marco. But he was kind and affectionate in nature, made and kept warm friends, and by his personal influence as well as his preaching did much to help and mould the characters of others. His unselfish devotion to his work is beyond all cavil, and his patriotism and love of liberty, without a trace of ambition for personal distinction or other gain for himself, are clearly written in the story of his life. His courage was great, even to death, and yet under torture he flinched and wavered. This, however, was due more to the extreme sensitiveness of his constitution than to lack of moral courage. As some one said, “He had the heart, but not the fibre, of a martyr.” The difficult point in his character is that in regard to his prophetic claims. It is impossible to believe that he was a deliberate cheat. It is equally impossible to deny that he went beyond the bounds of sober reason in claiming the gift of prophecy and the immediate inspiration of God, and his consent to have his claims tested by the ordeal of fire and in the person of another is not to be defended. The difficulty is most probably and charitably to be met by the view that Savonarola was sincere in his belief of his prophetic mission, and yet could not feel always sure of it. There was a border land of fanaticism which he did not wholly escape.

As a preacher Savonarola stands among the most eminent in history. His natural gift of oratory was unquestionable. He had that nameless something which throws the spell over hearers and captures them while it lasts. Crowds flocked to hear him, and multitudes were both transiently and permanently moved and moulded by his preaching. His figure was slight but erect and firm, his complexion dark but refined, his nose aquiline, his lips full and mobile, his eye keen and flashing, his hands thin and delicate, his gestures graceful and appropriate; and his voice, at first somewhat harsh, soon was mellowed by use, and became rich, sonorous, full and distinct. In mind he was well endowed with both the reasoning and the imaginative faculty. Scholastic subtlety and acuteness are found in his sermons, as well as cleverness of speculation and sweep of fancy. His training was thor-

ough in the Dominican curriculum, and he was ever a student and thinker. His theology was in accord with the Catholic orthodoxy of his age, having been chiefly formed by Aquinas. But his knowledge of Scripture and his reforming soul encouraged the entrance of many evangelical opinions into his sermons. Yet he was in this regard by no means the peer of the other great reformers. The Catholic elements of thought predominate in his preaching. Besides the scholastic traces, and in spite of the struggle of his better knowledge of Scripture, the allegorical method of interpretation too much prevails and mars the force of his sermons. These would not measure up to the standard set by the later reformers, but they show the resources and power of the man, and as far as reported and printed sermons can they sustain the traditional reputation of the preacher. Their language is clear, simple and pleasing, their thought and feeling elevated and strong.

With Savonarola ends the line of fore-reformers. When he was executed at Florence Luther was a fourteen-year-old lad in school at Eisenach, and helping to earn his scanty living by singing in the streets, and filling one stage of his preparation for his mighty work. Among Luther's predecessors the preëminent names are those of Wiclif, Huss and Savonarola, and the greatest of these in leadership was the first, the greatest in preaching the last. All were persecuted, two suffered martyrdom; but their work was not in vain, and their lives have counted for much among the forces for good in the world. On an old banner, painted by Fra Angelico, carried by Savonarola to call the people to worship, and preserved yet in his cell at San Marco, we read: *Nos prædicamus Christum crucifixum.*

CHAPTER XI

THE REFORMATION, AND PREACHING IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

With the beginning of the great Protestant revolt from the Roman Catholic Church in the sixteenth century a new era dawns upon the world. The gathering forces of new learning, of discovery and scientific progress,

and of reformatory movement within the church, which had marked the fifteenth century, all contributed their various kinds of power toward that momentous revolution.

In preaching the new note which had sounded out in the fore-reformers, but had seemed to be stifled by persecution and martyrdom, found a clearer resonance in the work of the great reformers of the sixteenth century. The voice of Savonarola had not long been hushed at Florence before the little university town of Wittenberg, in Saxony, was ringing with the bold challenge of a young monk and professor who was soon to shake the world with a power mightier than that of the eloquent Italian. And the notes were reverberated throughout all Western Europe, even on toward the end of the century, when, in 1572, the last of these strenuous reformers passed away in the sturdy Scotchman, John Knox. The voice of religious reform mingled with all other sounds of movement in this great century, and it is not easy to keep distinct the separate tones. Or, to drop the figure, all other affairs were inextricably mixed with those of religion, and the history of the Reformation is during its progress almost the history of Europe. This makes it desirable that we should give a little attention to general affairs in Western Christendom in this time.

I. EUROPE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

At the end of the fifteenth century Spain, united, rich, and arrogant, assumes a great rôle in European history. And this leading place is greatly enhanced during the first half of the sixteenth century by the accession of the young king (1519) to the empire as Charles V. After him his narrow and bigoted son, Philip II., in his wars with the Netherlands and England, contrives to lower Spanish prestige in European affairs.

In Italy the old confusion still continues. The papal states, rescued by the military genius of Pope Julius II., were impoverished by the extravagance of Leo X. They played no important part as political forces in this time. Naples was a bone of contention between Spain and France, but it was held by the former. Francis I. of

France tried hard to gain possessions in northern Italy also, but, though victorious at Marignano in 1515, he was defeated at Pavia in 1525, and his attempt was unsuccessful. Still there was no sign of political unity or power for Italy as a whole.

In Germany the opening of the sixteenth century found Maximilian I. on the imperial throne, but he was no great ruler and his grasp of power was feeble. To this shadowy phantom of empire came by choice of the electors in 1519 the young Charles, King of Spain, as grandson of Ferdinand and Isabella, Duke of Burgundy and ruler of the Netherlands by virtue of descent from Charles the Bold, and heir in direct line to the Hapsburg dominions of Austria and its connections in Germany. To this was added the Spanish sovereignty over Naples and Sicily and the newly discovered countries of America. It was a strange combination of circumstances which made this young ruler heir to so great possessions, but the empire added little or nothing to his real authority and much to his burdens. He was a man of courage, wisdom, patience; but the task of regulating so many peoples of different tongues and interests, and just in the throes of the greatest religious revolution of history, was too much even for his talents as a statesman and skill as a warrior. Tired with the struggle he abdicated in 1555, leaving the Austrian possessions with the imperial dignity to his brother Ferdinand, and his other dominions to his son Philip II. of Spain. Ferdinand was not formally elected till 1558, and reigned only a few years, being succeeded by Maximilian II. The political significance of the empire was in nowise enhanced under their reigns.

For the first fifteen years of the new century Louis XII., a man of some ability, was king of France, but bequeathed to his dashing son, Francis I., the fatal policy of aggression in Italy. Francis was by no means the least able of the three brilliant sovereigns—Charles V., the emperor, and Henry VIII. of England being the other two—whose reigns distinguished the age. History has much to tell of his relations with his brother monarchs, of his persecutions of his Protestant subjects, and something of his efforts to promote culture among his people. The brief reign of Henry II. was somewhat promising, but his un-

timely death left confusion and trouble in France. His three sons—Francis II. (husband of Mary Stuart), Charles IX. and Henry III.—followed in rapid succession, with the shadows and shames that marked their rule. Charles IX. was on the throne when our period closes (1572) and Bartholomew's Night had not long occurred—August 24th.

In England Henry VII., sagacious and economical, built up the weakened royal power and accumulated a considerable treasure, so that his clever, able, unprincipled and tyrannical son, Henry VIII. (1509-1547), found a strong kingdom when he came to the throne. Under him and his children, Edward VI. (1547), Mary (1553), and Elizabeth (1558), with painful fluctuations, and under storm and stress, the modern England as a Protestant nation had its birth.

Turbulent and unhappy Scotland suffered its mournful defeat at Flodden under James IV. in 1513. James V. followed with a disastrous reign, and in turn left the distracted kingdom to his beautiful but ill-fated daughter, Mary Stuart (1542-1587). Long regencies and many conspiracies and tumults marked these unfortunate reigns.

Turning from political to social affairs, we remark that the life and customs of the various European peoples varied, of course, in different lands; but there were matters of general interest in which all were more or less concerned that give to the sixteenth century a place of high importance in the history of civilization. Yet in this sphere the distinctive feature still was the religious, other matters chiefly continued the impulses and conditions brought over from the fifteenth century.

The classes remained as before, but the progress of religion and culture, the upheavals and wars, the final decay of feudalism and chivalry, as understood in the Middle Ages, marked the transition to modern civilization. The great religious and political questions of the age occupied all minds, and there was much debate and change of attitude among the people. Yet the strife did not produce always the sweet flowers of piety; and moral conditions were not so profoundly changed as would seem true on first thought. Catholic writers sneer at the word "reformation" as a misnomer, and adduce sayings of Luther

and other reformers in criticism of moral conditions to show that there was no real improvement under Protestant auspices. It is true that fearful evils continued to mar the face of European society, but there can be no doubt that moral reform was upon the whole advanced.

The now established use of gunpowder had revolutionized warfare, and that dreadful curse of humanity was made even more terrible and destructive than ever before. Its waste and demoralization were sad features in the life of the reforming century. Yet, in spite of wars and changes, trade and commerce increased, for the discovery of America and the enlargement of men's knowledge of other lands and contact with them stimulated industry. There were many wild financial schemes and much unrest, and yet the production and power of wealth went on. The general character of the century was one of alertness in all departments of life. The dead past was left to bury its dead, and men were busy in the living present and looking to a grander future.

In science, art and literature the age was full of activity. The discoveries of the fifteenth century had produced a wonderful interest in physical and mathematical science. Copernicus (d. 1543) propounded his theory of the solar system. Tycho Brahe pushed on astronomical science. Paracelsus (d. 1541) made great additions to knowledge in chemistry and medicine, and Francis Bacon, a bright boy of ten years of age at the end of this period, was already beginning to think and giving promise of power to come. The great artists of the Renaissance brought their lives and works over into the new century. Michel Angelo Buonarotti lived and worked on till 1563. Da Vinci (1519) and Raphael (1520) died just as the Reformation began, but Correggio (d. 1553) and Titian (d. 1576) lived through it. In the Netherlands the Van Eycks and Holbein were opening the way for their more brilliant successors, while Albert Dürer (d. 1548) and Lucas Cranach (d. 1555) were laying the foundation of modern German art.

In literature the impulse from the Revival of Letters went on with power. Learning was the delight of the age, and none of the principal lands of Europe were without distinguished representatives in the republic of let-

ters. Spain and Italy furnished in Lope de Vega, Calderon, Cervantes, Ariosto, Tasso, and others, great names to the history of literature, while scholars in more profound fields, like Bembo, Sadoleto, Bellarmine, and others, held high place. In England good old Roger Ascham, the teacher of the Princess Elizabeth, must not be forgotten, nor the famous literary men of that well-known circle which adorned her reign. But in the earlier time the leading humanist in England was the brilliant and unfortunate Sir Thomas More, the author of "Utopia," friend of Erasmus, and victim of Henry VIII. In France the scholarly work of Faber Stapulensis (Le Fèvre d'Étaples) belongs to this early period. But the leading literary genius of the time was the satirist François Rabelais (1483-1553). He was a priest upon whom his vows sat lightly, and a monk of two different orders successively without being an ornament to either. But he was a diligent student and a master of several languages, including Hebrew and Greek. His famous satire, *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, scored the evils of the time, sparing neither clergy nor pope.

The greatest of the humanists was the world-famous Desiderius Erasmus (1468-1536), born at Rotterdam, educated in his early years among the Brethren of the Common Life, but owing most of his learning to his own efforts, spurred by an indomitable thirst for knowledge and led by a clear and vigorous intellect. He travelled and studied the classics in France, England, Italy, Germany and Switzerland. Born a Dutchman he was a citizen of the world. One of his greatest services to culture and religion was the editing and publishing of the Greek New Testament. He also wrote a book on the Art of Preaching, and numerous other works, one of the most famous and influential of which was the satire, *Encomium Moriae* (*Laus Stultitiae*, "Praise of Folly"), written in elegant Latin, and dedicated to Sir Thomas More in playful punning upon his name and the Greek title. In the book Folly praises herself as one of the great powers of the world, and thus holds up to ridicule the sins and weaknesses of the age. Prelates and preachers are unsparingly handled, and thus the author served the reform spirit by attacking the grosser evils of the day. But

Luther well said of him that he showed the evil without the remedy.¹

Along with Erasmus should be named the great German humanist, John Reuchlin (1455-1522), the famous scholar and jurist, the uncle and helper of Philip Melancthon, the fine Hebrew student and teacher, the friend and maker of scholars, the author of many books. Nor must we forget the knightly friend of Luther, Ulrich von Hutten (1480-1523), scholar, poet, satirist and letter writer, whose trenchant pen and cultured mind were keen blades in the fight against churchly corruption.

2. COURSE AND EFFECTS OF THE REFORMATION

The particular events of the Reformation can for our purposes be better considered in connection with the developments in preaching and the lives of preachers. Here it will suffice merely to glance at the general course and effects of the movement.

Those loud calls for reform in doctrine and morals which had sounded out in the two preceding centuries grew in volume, and had to be heard even by the unwilling in the sixteenth century. The storm center was Germany; the occasion well known. In the year 1517 a Dominican friar of considerable talent as a popular preacher, John Tetzel by name, was appointed by superior ecclesiastical authorities to preach and sell indulgences in Saxony. He made a hawking peddler's affair of it, and is said to have declared that as soon as the coin jingled in his box a soul would fly out of purgatory.

Tetzel's conduct aroused the young Martin Luther, Augustinian monk and professor in the Saxon university of Wittenberg, and induced him to attack the practice of dispensing indulgences. This he did by posting a series of ninety-five theses, or propositions, on the door of the castle church at Wittenberg as a public challenge to disputation on the points involved. The theses were read far and wide and created a mighty stir. With this beginning events moved on. Efforts were made by the pope and his partisans to stop Luther from going further,

¹ "Satisfecit quod malum ostendit; at bonum ostendere et in terram promissionis ducere non potuit." Words often quoted.

but to no purpose. Debate only widened and intensified the breach. Luther soon had a following all over Germany. The great events of the Reformation followed fast, and soon involved all Europe. In Switzerland, first at Zürich and later at Geneva, reforming doctrines spread. Even Italy and Spain were somewhat touched by the movement, and in northern and eastern Europe the leaven worked. France was deeply moved, but the persecuting policy of Francis and his successors made the reformers mostly exiles. In England and Scotland, also, the doctrines of the Reformation found acceptance, and wrought out their well-known historic fruits. The effects produced by the Reformation upon the life, the thought and the subsequent history of the world were far-reaching and permanent, especially in the religious sphere.

Looking over the whole field we see that thenceforth the western world has two leading forms of the Christian faith, with many variations on the Protestant side. A new time has come for Christianity. No more is it Rome and heretics, but now it is Rome and Protestantism. In some lands one, in some the other, is in the ascendant; but the history of preaching, as well as of all the other institutions of Christianity, must henceforth be written from two different points of view.

The characteristic of Protestantism was its revolt from a corrupted church on the basis of the supreme authority of the Word of God. This character it has preserved in the main, and from this fundamental principle there have flowed important consequences. One of these has been the great variations among the Protestants themselves. This came from asserting the rights of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture and of freedom to choose one's belief. Thus what has been lost to unity has been gained to liberty, though only slowly and by degrees has true religious freedom gained a sure and permanent place in even Protestant countries. Another important result has been the parallel march of reverence and criticism in handling the Bible. In some cases reverence has lapsed into literalism, in others criticism has passed into rejection; but the sound mean of an intelligent acceptance of the Bible properly interpreted as the norm of religious belief and practice has held its own and

produced splendid results in the spread and maintenance of Christian truth. The far-reaching effect of this principle on preaching we shall see later.

The effect of the Reformation on the Roman Catholic Church has been the seemingly paradoxical one of both weakening and strengthening it. The rivals of Rome's exclusive claim to be the church of God on earth had hitherto been the old and decrepit East and the scattering sects of so-called heretics who had arisen here and there to protest, to suffer, to decline. But now that claim was challenged by representatives of the highest culture and noblest piety in every land of Europe. The movement was too general to be put down as merely a heresy, and too vigorous to be ignored or cajoled.

On the other hand the forces of reform within the church gained power. The corruption of morals which had been one of the prime causes of the Protestant revolt was greatly checked. There has been no Borgia among the popes since the Reformation. Also the pious elements within the old church asserted themselves, and both charitable and missionary enterprises received great stimulus. And finally the great Council of Trent, which was called to deal with all the questions raised by Protestantism, reassured good Catholics everywhere by removing some crying abuses and by putting forth in remarkably clear form the essential doctrines of the Catholic faith. That council, forced by Luther's revolution, is rightly regarded as one of the mightiest bulwarks of the Roman church, giving it a new and stronger lease on life.

3. RELATION OF THE REFORMATION TO PREACHING

We come now to consider the more particular relation of the Reformation to preaching. It is at once apparent how close that relation is. The great events and achievements of that mighty revolution were largely the work of preachers and preaching; for it was by the Word of God through the ministry of earnest men who believed, loved and taught it, that the best and most enduring work of the Reformation was done. And, conversely, the events and principles of the movement powerfully reacted on preaching itself, giving it new spirit, new power, new

forms. So that the relation between the Reformation and preaching may be succinctly described as one of mutual dependence, aid and guidance.

This applies chiefly, of course, to Protestant preaching, but the Catholic pulpit also was in some degree stimulated and otherwise wholesomely affected by the movement. And thus, in the most general view, a distinctly new epoch in the history of preaching meets us now, and the greatest and most fruitful one since the fourth century. Great as was the Catholic preaching of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries it is not to be compared with that of the sixteenth century reformers either in its character or in its enduring results. Well does Christlieb¹ say: "The age of the Reformation makes the deepest cleft, the sharpest turning-point in the historical development of Christian preaching, as to contents and form, spirit and character." This new character of preaching is commonly recognized by Protestant writers, and its causes and elements assigned with substantial unanimity of judgment. The points are well summarized by Broadus² as being: (1) a revival of preaching, (2) a revival of Biblical preaching, (3) a revival of controversial preaching, and (4) a revival of preaching upon the doctrines of grace. Catholic writers also recognize a new era in preaching, but naturally give both the character and causes a different statement from that of Protestants. We shall see more of this when we come to study the Catholic preaching of the age,³ but here it is proper to take the Protestant point of view.

Discussion of the personality and preaching of individuals among the reformers will be given in the sketches that are to follow; but in viewing the general character of Reformation preaching it will be well to keep clearly before us the following points: (1) The debt of Reformation preaching to the new age; (2) The new emphasis given to preaching as a vital element of Christian worship and life; (3) The influence of their conflict with error upon the preaching of the reformers; (4) The place and use of Scripture in their sermons; (5) The homiletical methods of the time as shown in some of the leading reformers.

¹ Art. in Herzog, Bd. 18, supplement.

² *Hist. Prea.*, p. 113 ff.

³ Below, Chap. XV.

(1.) The Reformation was a part, and a very large part, of that general forward movement in Western Christian civilization which is the glory of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Now the Christian world was emerging from mediævalism, as just a thousand years before it had passed out of antiquity. But how different were the conditions into which these two momentous turning points led! Then it was a fall, now it was a rise; then it was a passage from decay to chaos, now from a lower to a higher civilization; the fifth and sixth centuries trembled with despair, the fifteenth and sixteenth quivered with hope. Preaching felt the throb.

The discoveries of science and navigation enlarged the thoughts of men, the new methods of warfare made great political changes, the art of printing introduced a new age in literature, the revival of classical learning and the new birth of art gave culture a higher tone—and all, as we have seen, quickened the mental energies of mankind. Now, as preaching is in large part and essentially an intellectual exercise and one of the forces of culture, it was inevitable that it should respond to this new breath of life in the world of thought. And it did. There is a new intellectual vigor in preaching, a fresh and strong grasp of mind, which is in notable contrast with the pulpit work of the times immediately preceding. And it is natural that this should be especially true of Protestant preaching, because Protestantism was the party of progress in the religious world.

Also in the sphere of general social and political life the tokens of a new time were not wanting. Feudalism had run its course, the burgher class had come to power, and now, too, though but little as yet and slowly, the great common people must be reckoned with as a force in human affairs. In various ways the right of the common man to be heard and considered is gaining recognition. The Peasants' War, with its mainly just and reasonable demands for popular rights, is one of the many indications in this direction. Popular preaching and the translation of the Bible into the speech of the people show that this recognition of the great masses of humanity was germane to the religious revolution of the time. Luther was himself a peasant's son, and, though he did

not approve of the Peasants' War, he never lost his sympathy for the class from which he sprang. In every age the pulpit has had distinguished representatives who stood with and for the people in their aspirations for an enlargement of rights and privileges in social and political life, and this sympathy has not failed to impart vigor and strength to preaching. It was so during the Reformation.

(2.) And now, also, there was laid a new and mighty emphasis on preaching. Not for long centuries had the office been held in such high regard as it won during the Reformation. There were several ways in which this renewed interest found expression.

We have seen how, in the ages of decline, preaching was neglected by the clergy. The preaching orders of monks were long a protest against this neglect, but now they, too, had fallen into decay. Wiclif's "poor priests" were also a rebuke to the negligent clergy, but the Lollards had been put down. The neglect was general, and there were many complaints, but the diligence of the reformers in preaching is something marvellous. Both Luther and Calvin were indefatigable preachers, and their example was contagious.

It is true that the reformers used other means to promote their cause. They invoked and employed the aid of the civil powers in the different ways appropriate to the different countries in which they labored. Thus Luther leaned on the Elector of Saxony, and made his famous appeal to the princes and nobles of Germany; Zwingli, Calvin and the other Swiss reformers sought and secured the coöperation of the councils of the cities; in England, through all the vicissitudes of the reform movement, the prelates and preachers were much mixed up with the court and government; and in Scotland Knox was in constant touch with the Lords of the Congregation and in continual conflict with Mary Stuart. The reformers also made diligent and efficient use of the press and of correspondence, both public and private. Nor did they fail to employ teaching, personal influence, discussion and debate. In fact, every legitimate means of advancing their cause seems to have been used, but none the less it remains true that their chief instrument was

the preaching of the Word of God, and that the most of them were exceedingly diligent in the work. A few examples will abundantly illustrate this point.

As is well known,¹ Luther was reluctant to enter on the work of preaching, and only did so at the request of his ecclesiastical superiors while still a monk, in 1515. At once, however, he began to realize the value of preaching, and the orator's instinct within him was awakened, so that he sometimes preached as many as four times a day. After his work as a reformer was fully under way his diligence in preaching was one of his distinguishing marks. During 1529, it is recorded,² he preached three or four times a week; in 1541, often four times on a Sunday and two or three times in the week; on holidays commonly twice. His theory grew out of his own practice. In his *Table Talk*,³ speaking of the urgency of his friends about his preaching, he says: "I am now aged, and have had much labor and pains. Nothing causes Osiander's pride more than his idle life; for he preaches but twice a week, yet has a yearly stipend of four hundred guilders." With such teaching and example before them, it is no wonder to find that Luther's friends and fellow-laborers were likewise zealous preachers and magnified their office by much use.

Calvin's astonishing diligence is also matter of history. Well does Broadus⁴ say: "The extent of his preaching looks to us wonderful. While lecturing at Geneva to many hundreds of students (sometimes eight hundred), while practically a ruler of Geneva and constant adviser of the Reformed in all Switzerland, France and the Netherlands, England and Scotland, and while composing his so extensive and elaborate works, he would often preach every day. For example, I notice that the two hundred sermons on Deuteronomy, which are dated, were all delivered on week days in the course of little more than a year, and sometimes on four or five days in succession."

The Zürich reformers were no less busy. Zwingli had set the example of frequent preaching. Leo Jud wore

¹ Nebe, *Zur Geschichte der Predigt*, Bd. II., S. 1.

² Nebe, *op. cit.*, S. 5.

³ Hazlitt's ed., Bohn's Lib., p. 188.

⁴ *Hist. Prea.*, p. 121 f.

himself out at it. Bullinger often preached six or seven times a week, till, in his later years, the council, warned by Jud's breakdown, interposed, gave him an assistant, and forbade his preaching more than twice a week.¹

In England the "unpreaching prelates" were the object of fierce attack by the reformers, who took good care that their own example should enforce their polemic. In his famous *Sermon of the Plough*² sturdy old Latimer pays his respects to "unpreaching prelates, lording loiterers, and idle ministers" in these terms: "But this much I dare say, that since lording and loitering hath come up, preaching hath come down, contrary to the Apostles' time; for they preached and lorded not, and now they lord and preach not. For they that are lords will go ill to plough; it is no meet office for them; it is not seeming for their estate. Thus came up lording loiterers; thus crept in unpreaching prelates, and so have they long continued." Further on he continues: "And now I would ask a strange question: Who is the most diligent bishop and prelate in all England, that passes all the rest in doing his office? I can tell, for I know who it is; I know him well. But now I think I see you listening and hearkening that I should name him. There is one that passes all the others, and is the most diligent prelate and preacher in all England. And will ye know who it is? I will tell you—it is the Devil. He is the most diligent preacher of all others; he is never out of his diocese; he is never from his cure; you shall never find him unoccupied; he is ever in his parish; he keeps residence at all times; you shall never find him out of the way; call for him when you will he is ever at home. He is the most diligent preacher in all the realm; he is ever at his plough; no lording or loitering can hinder him; he is ever applying his business; you shall never find him idle, I warrant you." Of Latimer himself, Hooper,³ Coverdale, Jewel,⁴ and many others there are records and statements to the effect of their faithful attention to the preaching part of their work. The same is true also of Knox and his fellow-workers in Scotland.

¹ For further particulars see below, pp. 408, 411, 415.

² Fish, *Masterpieces*, I., p. 134.

³ Below, p. 497.

⁴ Below, p. 508.

Among the reformers preaching resumes its proper place in worship. The elaborate ritual of the Catholic service had made the sermon but a small affair; the celebration of the mass had become the center of worship, and around that much ceremonial had gathered, so that but little stress was placed upon the reading and exposition of the divine Word. But in the reformed services the mass is abolished, and the exposition of Scripture becomes the main thing. The Lord's Supper is observed periodically, but not at every service. Thus preaching becomes more prominent in worship than it had been perhaps since the fourth century.

Nebe¹ mentions the oft-quoted remark of Luther, that preaching is the most important part of the worship, and illustrates Luther's high regard for preaching by a number of quotations from his sermons, in which he speaks of preaching as "the power and strength of Christendom," and as being the office of teaching all the virtues and duties of Christianity, of converting and edifying souls, and the like. But in all this we must remember that Luther was looking upon preaching as the exposition of the Word of God, and by no means as a man's oratorical performance. Thus in his *Table Talk* he says:² "I am sure and certain, when I go up to the pulpit to preach or read, that it is not my word I speak, but that my tongue is the pen of a ready writer, as the Psalmist has it. God speaks in the prophets and men of God, as St. Peter in his epistle says: The holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Therefore we must not separate or part God and man, according to our natural reason or understanding. In like manner every hearer must say: I hear not St. Paul, St. Peter, or a man speak, but God himself." So in exalting preaching he was not lifting up the preacher, but the message that he brings from God to the people. This high view of preaching was shared by the other reformers, and became one of the distinctive notes of the Reformation.

There is no doubt that in Protestant worship—especially in the Reformed churches—this tendency went too far, and in course of time the sermon too much encroached upon the other parts of the service. But

¹ *Op. cit.*, S. 6 ff.

² P. 16.

even in those Protestant churches, as the Lutheran and English, which retained much of the historic liturgy rendered into the language of the people, the sermon acquired a greater place in the order of worship than it had for ages enjoyed. This naturally tended to dignify the preaching office in the minds both of the preacher himself and of his hearers, and with increased respect came increased power.

Along with this higher estimation of preaching it was natural that there should be required a better preparation, both intellectual and spiritual, in the preachers. The mental and moral unfitness of very many of the clergy under the old conditions was one of the main objects of attack and of reform. The reformers were bound by every reason to see that in this respect there should be great and manifest improvement. And they were very careful of it. Certainly some unfit men—ill-educated and ill-regulated—got into the Protestant ministry; but this was the exception. All the reformers insisted on a high standard of religious and educational preparation for the pulpit. It is well known that the leading reformers were themselves men of liberal culture. On Luther's learning—admitted by all—Brömel¹ well remarks that he was a "universally trained" man, all the elements of the culture of his time appear in his sermons: the Latin classics, philosophy, dialectic, natural history—as far as understood in his days—history, the church fathers and other ecclesiastical writers. At twenty-four years of age young John Calvin was one of the most accomplished scholars of the time, and through life a hard-working student. Law, languages, theology, philosophy, history, to say nothing of all Biblical lore, were at his finger's ends. Zwingli was full of the Humanist culture of the age, and his chief impulse as a reformer came from this side. Œcolampadius, Butzer, Capito, Pellican, Jud, Myconius, Bullinger, were all lights of learning as well as of reform. In England Latimer, Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Coverdale, Parker, Jewel, and many others were highly educated and learned men. Knox, also, though not so great in this direction as in others, and by no means the peer of Luther or Calvin, was not deficient in such education as

¹ *Homiletische Charakterbilder*, S. 93 ff.

could be had in his time and country, diligently improved his opportunities to study with Calvin while an exile at Geneva, and took up late in life the study of Hebrew and Greek.¹

Nor were the reformers content to be men of large culture themselves alone, and simply set the example of diligence in study; they were concerned to teach the young men who labored with them and should come after them. Wittenberg and Geneva were seats of Protestant learning, and they were thronged with students from all over Europe. Cranmer was careful to provide for the training of the future leaders of the English church, and brought to Oxford and Cambridge such men as Peter Martyr Vermigli, Martin Butzer, John à Lasco and others. While in the *Table Talk* Luther again and again insists that the preacher should be simple in speech, so that the people could understand him, he by no means undervalues learning, as the following passages show:² "A preacher should be a logician and a rhetorician, that is, he must be able to teach and to admonish. When he preaches touching an article he must, first, distinguish it. Secondly, he must define, describe and show what it is. Thirdly, he must produce sentences out of Scriptures, therewith to prove and strengthen it. Fourthly, he must with examples explain and declare it. Fifthly, he must adorn it with similitudes; and, lastly, he must admonish and rouse up the lazy, earnestly reprove all the disobedient, all false doctrine, and the authors thereof." Again, "Young divines ought to study Hebrew, to the end they may be able to compare Greek and Hebrew words together, and discern their properties, natures and strength."

This culture was required not only by the evident proprieties in the case, and by the very nature of the preaching office, but was emphasized by the peculiar circumstances in which the reformers found themselves.

(3.) The stern conflict which the reformers had to wage with error demanded abilities and training of no mean order. The task of Protestantism was not easy. Centuries had hardened into fixed custom the abuses against which the reformers fought; their opponents were often men of keen dialectical skill, and the early

¹ Broadus, *Hist. Preca.*, p. 194 f.

² Pp. 188, 193.

successes of Protestantism stirred the defenders of the old order to unusual exertions and better training. On the other side, the very character of the errors which they had to oppose served to quicken and render more earnest the preaching of the reformers.

The scandalous corruption among the clergy, and, in fact everywhere, greatly aroused earnest souls who felt that this condition of affairs should and could be amended. Preaching must always amount to something when it has definite evils to attack and specific warnings to give. And the awakening of the general conscience, which has already been adduced as one of the causes of the Reformation, powerfully fortified to the hearers the appeals and warnings and denunciations of the preachers. The consciousness of a high and holy mission to uplift and purify the characters of men by the preaching of the Word of God had a large and fruitful place in the minds and hearts of the reformers.

Necessarily, also, the preaching of these men was much occupied with errors of belief, and was therefore largely polemical and doctrinal. Luther says;¹ "Wickliffe and Huss assailed the immoral conduct of the papists; but I chiefly oppose and resist their doctrine; I affirm roundly and plainly that they preach not the truth. To this I am called; I take the goose by the neck and set the knife to its throat. When I can show that the papists' doctrine is false, as I have shown, then I can easily prove that their manner of life is evil. For when the word remains pure, the manner of life, though something therein be amiss, will be pure also." Externalism had obscured the truth and hidden away the heart of the gospel. The true nature of Christ's work for men and of the means whereby its blessed fruits were available to them must be freshly and more clearly explained. And so the great core of reform preaching is justification by faith—that gracious act of a sovereign but loving God whereby the repentant and believing sinner is for Christ's sake pardoned and acquitted. Penances and purgatory, the almost divine mediation of the Virgin and the saints, the whole theory of merits and indulgences, every form of human satisfaction for sin, must give way before the true doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in an all-sufficient Saviour.

¹ *Table Talk*, p. 186.

"Christ and him Crucified," in a clearer light and a fuller tone, is the burden of the preaching; "justification by faith without the works of the law" is the keystone of the doctrine. "Protestantism was born of the doctrines of grace, and in the proclamation of these the Reformation preaching found its truest and highest power."¹

(4.) But the glory of Reformation preaching—that great principle in which all others are necessarily involved—was its use of Scripture. In the hands of the reformers the Word of God again comes into its heritage and rules the pulpit.

In the first place the Bible is recognized as the supreme authority in matters of faith and practice—*credenda et agenda*. The great reformers held fast this principle, which has already been dwelt on as the characteristic element of a true reform in Christian doctrine, worship and life.² They naturally respected much the feelings, convictions and reasonings of the Christian mind, believing that the Holy Spirit enlightens and leads those who truly trust in God and seek to know and do his will. But these were secondary and subordinate means; if these judgments were in accord with the Word of God they could be accepted, but that Word must be the decisive test, the ultimate appeal. Further, the reformers, though revolutionary, were not disposed to break wholly with the past. Tradition was allowed some place, and many beliefs and practices, more or less modified to suit the new order of things, were retained which might better have been spared. Luther was rather more conservative than Zwingli and Calvin, and the English reformers decidedly more so than Knox. None were ready to go with the extremists of their party, and still less were any disposed to favor the fanatical schemes of those who under cover of reformation would introduce anarchy. This cautious temper is responsible for the retention in some Protestant bodies of some practices—as infant baptism—which had been sanctioned and established by the Catholic Church, but without Scripture authority. But notwithstanding these deficiencies the main contention of the reformers as to the authority of the Bible was clearly and bravely maintained. Tradition and "the Christian consciousness"—

¹ Broadus, *Hist. Prea.*, p. 117.

² *Ante*, p. 315 f.

to use a modern expression—were firmly held subordinate to Scripture.

This fundamental attitude of the reformers appears constantly in their writings and sermons, and is one of the commonplaces of the history of the Reformation in all lands. A few illustrations, however, may not be superfluous.

Brömel¹ speaks of this use of Scripture by the reformers as "one of the levers by which they removed the rubbish in the old church and brought out to light again the everlasting light of the gospel." Besides Luther he instances Urbanus Regius, Brentz, Cœlius, Corvinus, Dietrich, Mathesius, and others among the pupils and friends of the great leader, who "all not only preached the Word of God, but they so preached it that the Word was quite the main thing, the art of preaching the subsidiary thing." In Luther's *Table Talk*,² among many others, are found these characteristic utterances: "A theologian should be thoroughly in possession of the basis and source of faith—that is to say, the Holy Scriptures. Armed with this knowledge it was that I confounded and silenced all my adversaries; for they seek not to fathom and understand the Scriptures; they run over them negligently and drowsily; they speak, they write, they teach, according to the suggestion of their heedless imaginations. My counsel is, that we draw water from the true source and fountain, that is, that we diligently search the Scriptures. He who wholly possesses the text of the Bible is a consummate divine." Again, "Let us not lose the Bible, but with diligence and in fear and invocation of God, read and preach it. While that remains and flourishes, all prospers with the state; it is head and empress of all arts and faculties."

Calvin, of course, repeatedly expresses the same profound conviction, and in a sermon on 2 Tim. 3:16, 17, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," etc., he unfolds in detail the supreme authority and sufficiency of the written Word. The first three of the sermons in Bullinger's *Decades*³ are devoted to the Word of God,

¹ *Op. cit.*, S. 98.

² P. 3.

³ *The Decades of Henry Bullinger, that is, Fifty Sermons Divided into Five Decades*; Parker Soc., ed. Thos. Harding. This is a reprint of an English translation published in 1577 and 1587.

and the nature and use of Scripture are at length unfolded. Among many strong sayings the following occurs toward the end of the second sermon as a summary:¹ "Dearly beloved, this hour ye have heard our bountiful Lord and God, 'who would have all men saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth,' how he hath revealed his word to all men throughout the whole world, to the intent that all men in all places, of what kind, age, or degree soever they be, may know the truth and be instructed in the true salvation; and may learn a perfect way to live rightly, well and holily, so that the man of God may be perfect, instructed to all good works. For the Lord in the word of truth hath delivered to his church all that is requisite to true godliness and salvation. Whatsoever things are necessary to be known touching God, the works, judgments, will and commandments of God, touching Christ, our faith in Christ, and the duties of an holy life! all those things, I say, are fully taught in the Word of God. Neither needeth the church to crave of any other, or else with men's supplies to patch up that which seemeth to be wanting in the Word of the Lord."

The English reformers are equally emphatic. In 1534 a set of instructions was drawn up (probably by Cranmer himself)² and sent to all the bishops for the guidance of the clergy. One of the items is as follows: "That from henceforth all preachers shall purely, sincerely, and justly preach the Scripture and Word of Christ, and not mix them up with man's institutions, nor make them believe that the force of God's law and man's law is like; nor that any man is able or hath power to dispense with God's law." Latimer, in his third sermon on the Lord's Prayer,³ thus speaks: "And because the Word of God is the instrument and fountain of all good things, we pray to God for the continuance of his word; that he will send godly and well learned men amongst us, which may be able to declare us his will and pleasure; so that we may glorify him in the hour of our visitation, when God shall visit us, and reward every one according unto his desert."

¹ *Decades*, Vol. I., p. 69.

² *Works of Abp. Cranmer*, Parker Society, ed. J. E. Cox, p. 461.

³ *Sermons of Bp. Latimer*, Parker Soc., p. 354.

It follows from what has been said that the reformers gave to Scripture a better interpretation than that which had prevailed before. The petty and often ridiculous allegorizing which marred even the best mediæval preaching finds little or no place in the sermons of the reformers, save a trace here and there in Luther and some of his followers. It is refreshing indeed to pass from the wild and baseless spiritualizing of the mediæval preachers to the sober, clear, grammatical, and instructive expositions of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and others of their schools. Calvin's commentaries on the Bible are still very valuable, and have scarcely ever been surpassed for power to seize surely and express strongly the exact meaning of the sacred Word. In giving this new direction to preaching and basing it thus securely upon a sensible and reasoned interpretation of the Bible the reformers made one of the greatest possible contributions to Christian life and progress.

Again, it naturally follows that among the materials of reformatory preaching the Scriptures held the post of honor and power. Tales of the saints and other stories are banished. The petty fables and impossible adventures which had formed so large an element of mediæval Catholic preaching do not appear in the sermons of the Protestant reformers. Nor do we find in so large a degree the refinements of scholasticism, though this still shows traces of itself and leaves both in the structure and contents of sermons permanent impression. In Luther's earlier sermons there is more of it than in his later, and the dogmatic bent both of his and Calvin's followers is a well known affair of theological history. But all fair allowances and subtractions duly made, it stands out clearly and impressively true that the warp and filling of Reformation preaching was the Word of God.

Nor is it mere citation of texts, more or less apposite as proof of doctrine, that makes the bulk of this Scriptural content. There had been much of this sort of employment of Scripture in the mediæval preachers. But now the pulpit deals more in the exact application of Biblical passages to matters of doctrine; and above all, as we shall presently see, in exposition of the Word as the homiletical form of preaching. All three of the great reform-

ers delighted in expository preaching, and this was one of the most valuable and fruitful and enduring results of their labors. To this day the Lutheran and Presbyterian preachers have had among them many able and distinguished expounders of the Word.

(5.) The homiletical methods of the reformers of course varied with individuals among them. Yet in a general way it may be said that their exposition of Scripture naturally led them back toward the ancient homily as the prevailing sermon form. This tendency was increased by the reaction against scholasticism with its minute distinctions and subdivisions. There is less of logical analysis and of oratorical movement in the sermons of the reformers than in those of many of their predecessors and followers. But still there is no complete recurrence to the old loose homily, no entire renunciation of the more compact homiletical structure which was largely the gift of scholasticism to the pulpit. But this matter of method can best be presented by examples from some of the leading preachers.

Luther cannot be said to have had a rigid and unvarying homiletical method.¹ In his earlier work the traces of his Catholic training appear in the stiffer scholastic form than is to be found in his later sermons. In the *House-Postils*, as reported by Dietrich and others, the other extreme of free and easy conversational comment appears. In the few sermons (some of the *Church-Postils*) which he prepared by writing while at the Wartburg, there is naturally more attention to form and expression than he could bestow in his subsequent strenuous life; and it is said that he himself regarded these as his best sermons. But in the larger number of his discourses, as reported by Cruciger and others, we have his most characteristic method of verse by verse comment on the Gospel or Epistle for the day, or on some extended passage of his own selection. Luther's views of preaching, as being properly an exposition of the Word of God, are unfolded in many places in his sermons and his *Table Talk*. He bent to his work all the faculties of his nature and the

¹ See the excellent discussions in the works of Brömel and Nebe, which, however, have been tested by a measure of independent study.

culture of his mind. His exposition is usually marked by sobriety of judgment, but sometimes drops too easily into allegorizing and into polemics. But both these imperfections are easily understood when his training and nature, his circumstances and incitements are taken into account. All subtractions duly made, it remains that Luther was a mighty expounder of the Scriptures, and he left this method of preaching as a rich legacy to his followers.

Calvin began his career as an expository preacher while yet a young law student at Bruges, when, in an informal way, at the earnest request of the people, he taught the Scriptures to small gatherings. It became the delight and the established method of his life. His preaching differed from Luther's as the men themselves differed.¹ It has less of fancy, less of warmth, less of popular appeal, but more of steadiness, of logical connection, of severely exact interpretation. While he also commonly employed the verse by verse comment, both unity of theme and logical connection of thought are much in evidence. The notable series of sermons on the *Divinity and Glory of Christ*² are chiefly expository discourses on passages from the First Epistle to Timothy, with some from other Scriptures. While Calvin preached without notes, his delivery was deliberate enough to permit a reporter to get his exact language, and thus a large number of his sermons have come down.³ They are prevailingly expository. The structure is no more than what was natural to a very orderly mind which had no need to exert itself to produce connected thinking. The sermon published in Fish's *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*⁴ is on bearing afflictions. The two thoughts that trials are a necessary part of Christian experience, and that under them we have the best of consolations, are the ever-recurring theme, and under a variety of expository comment and illustration, they pervade the entire discourse.

¹ There is a striking parallel in Broadus, *Hist. Prea.*, p. 118 ff. Hering also, *Gesch. der Pred.*, S. 110 ff has some good observations on Calvin as compared with Luther.

² I used an old French edition of these while in Geneva, and there is also an old American edition of many of them in a volume of translated discourses of both Luther and Calvin, which has been found serviceable. ³ See Hering, *l. c.* ⁴ Vol. II., p. 12.

Of the Zürich reformers Zwingli was also prevailingly expository in method, but, strictly speaking, no specimens of his sermons survive. Bullinger¹ left a very large number of discourses, some in the crude old Swiss-German tongue, but many also carefully done into Latin by himself, most likely after preaching. Of these the famous *Decades*, a series of fifty discourses divided into five tens, are a treatise on theology in the form of sermons. They are without text and are topical, but they afford example of the preacher's careful interpretation of Scripture, and suggest the pains and clearness which must have characterized his more strictly expository addresses. In their English dress they were translated during the reign of Edward VI., and became one of the training books for the Anglican clergy. The style is clear, the tone spiritual and devout, the arrangement and division logical and perspicuous. He usually gives at the end a brief and clear summary of the thought. They naturally lack some of the life and vigor of spoken discourse.

The preachers of the English Reformation are not so predominantly expository in method as their brethren on the Continent, inclining more to the topical manner, and even when interpretative comment is followed, the adherence to text is perhaps less marked. Lesson and application are rather to the fore than exegesis. Yet there are instructive examples of pulpit exposition among the remains of the great English divines of the period. Even Latimer² has a vigorous and suggestive series on the Lord's Prayer, which were delivered in 1552 before the Duchess of Suffolk, at Grimsthorpe Castle, Lincolnshire. He often strays off, as is his manner, but there is many a shrewd and luminous unfolding of the meaning of the Word. Among the few sermons that have come down from Bishop Hooper³ is a striking series on the prophet Jonah, delivered before Edward VI. and his council in the year 1550. He thus states⁴ his reasons for taking this book as his theme: "This prophet

¹ *Bullinger's Decades*, Parker Soc., four vols.

² *Sermons of Latimer*, Parker Soc.

³ *Early Writings of Bishop Hooper*, Parker Soc., ed. Samuel Carr.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 445.

have I taken to interpretate for two causes. The one, to declare unto the king's majesty and his most honorable council, that the doctrine we preach unto his majesty's subjects is one and the same with the prophets' and apostles', and as old as the doctrine of them both, and not as new as these papists, and new learned men of papistry would bear the people in hand. The second cause is to declare which way the sinful world may be reconciled unto God. And for the better understanding of the prophet I will divide him into four parts. The first containeth into what danger Jonas fell by disobeying of God's commandment. The second part containeth how Jonas used himself in the fish's belly. The third part containeth the amendment and conversion of the Ninivites at the preaching of Jonas. The fourth part containeth an objurgation and rebuke of God because Jonas lamented the salvation of the people and city." Besides this general division each discourse is again divided into appropriate parts. While there is much of historical comment and lesson, the application to existing conditions in England is evidently the main thing in the preacher's mind. From Bishop Jewel there remains among other sermons a series on the Epistles to the Thessalonians.¹ These were his last discourses to his flock at Salisbury, and were published from his notes after his death, by his friend John Garbrand. They are replete with Jewel's learning and earnestness, but hardly take very high rank as expository discourses.

CHAPTER XII

PREACHERS OF THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY AND GERMAN SWITZERLAND

From our sketch of the Reformation and its effects it is fitting that we now come to a more particular study of the leading preachers of the great movement in the lands affected by it; and the natural thing is to begin with Germany and the great leader there.

¹ *Works of Bishop Jewel*, Parker Society's edition.

I. MARTIN LUTHER (1483-1546).

Martin Luther,¹ the son of peasant parents, was born at the little village of Eisleben, in Saxony, November 10, 1483. His father and mother were persons of vigorous mould and strong character, and they brought up their children with rigid severity and yet with parental affection, and nourished them in the simple Catholic piety common among the German peasantry at that time.

The Luthers were poor, but by one means and another Martin was sent to school at different places. When about fifteen years old he is at Eisenach, where he adds to his scanty means by singing before the houses of the wealthier folk and attracts the notice of good Frau Ursula Cotta, who gives him his board. In 1501 he is sent to the high school at Erfurt, where he distinguishes himself by hard study and good progress in learning. The father is ambitious that Martin shall be learned and a lawyer. It is at Erfurt, when twenty years of age, that Luther first has in his hands a complete copy of the Bible. He found the Latin Vulgate in the library one day, and was delighted with his discovery. Now he began to give to the sacred Word that loving interest and those lifelong studies which were to work such a revolution in the world. At Erfurt the young man, though full of life and spirits and fond of company, preserved his purity unsullied and was much given to prayer and devout meditation. Scholasticism and theology attracted him, and he neglected his legal studies for these. He also heard some reformatory principles taught and preached at Erfurt during his school days, but they seem not at the time to have made much impression on his mind. He took his degrees in the regular course at the University of Erfurt and was graduated Master of Arts

¹ There is a vast literature on Luther. I have found serviceable for this study, besides works on church history, the great *Life* in German by Julius Köstlin, which is now also available for American readers in the shorter form; Scribners, New York; C. G. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Predigt*; Wm. Beste's *Die bedeutendste Kanzelredner der Lutherischen Kirche des Reformationszeitalters*; and the fine discussion of Luther as preacher by Nebe, *Zur Gesch. der Pred.*, Bd. II., SS. 1-92. An old edition of translations of sermons by Luther and Calvin, the *Hauspostillen*, and some other sermons have also been consulted.

in 1505, second in a class of seventeen. He began his law studies again, to please his parents, but his heart was not in these. Full of internal struggles as to religion, he went to visit a friend, and found him dead—murdered in his bed. Shocked by this scene he went out into the open; a flash of lightning startled him. In the awe and dread of these experiences he vowed he would become a monk. The current of his life entered a new channel.

This decision greatly displeased Luther's parents, and he himself afterwards regretted it, but he adhered to his vow and entered the Augustinian monastery at Erfurt in July, 1505, carrying copies of Virgil and Plautus under his arm. He was fond of study, and was also a rigid and correct monk. He studied the Bible earnestly and prayed much. But all his exercises failed to bring the peace and satisfaction for which his spirit yearned. In this time of conflict and unrest he received help from the pious John Staupitz, vicar-general of the Augustinian order, who in one of his visits to the monastery at Erfurt became deeply interested in the bright and struggling young man. Staupitz told Martin to look to Christ alone, and not to his own works of devotion, as the source of peace. An old monk in the cloister gave him similar advice; and so by his studies of the Bible, by his own struggles, and by the help of those friends, Luther was gradually led on till he found satisfaction and assurance of pardon by trusting Christ alone for salvation.

In 1510 Luther was made professor at the University of Wittenberg, where he was to spend the rest of his life. It was during his early days at Wittenberg that at the earnest request of Staupitz, but with a genuine reluctance and self-distrust on his own part, Luther began to preach; at first in the little cloister chapel, and then, on the sickness of the pastor, in the town church. It is food for reflection that he thus modestly and falteringly took up what was to be the best and principal work of his variously busy life. But as he kept on the reluctance wore away, and he came to love the work of preaching with a devotion that never gave out. About this time, too (1511), occurred Luther's memorable visit to Rome, whither he was sent on business for his order. While in Rome he ascended the "Holy Stairway" on his knees,

like many another Catholic devotee; but yet it is true that the worldliness, corruption, and emptiness which he saw among the clergy in Rome, made a lasting impression on his mind, and that the words, "The just shall live by faith," kept ringing in his ears. He came back to his work at Wittenberg, was made a doctor in 1512, lectured on the Psalms, Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, and became more and more convinced of evangelical views. The theology of Augustine seized his mind, and the mysticism of Bernard and Tauler penetrated his soul. His love for preaching grew, and he began to teach that the preachers should give more diligent attention to their work and should preach less of penance and works, and more of repentance and faith.

In 1517 John Tetzel came preaching his indulgences, and on October 31st of that historic year, Luther put up his theses, and before he knew it the Reformation had begun. The bold deed of the young theologian at Wittenberg came like the notes of Gideon's trumpet to the discouraged in Israel, and called forth a deal of approval and discussion throughout all the land. In two weeks the theses were read all over Germany, and from now on the name of Martin Luther is a household word in German history. The events of his life after this are the events of the Reformation up to his death in 1546.

The story is too long, too full of incident, too important to be fully told here. But it may be well to recall the more important events of that stirring and influential life. Various unsuccessful attempts were made to hold Luther to the Catholic faith, but the pope excommunicated the bold monk, and he retorted by burning the bull of excommunication in 1520. Summoned to the imperial diet at Worms to answer before Charles V. and the assembled magnates, he bravely refused to recant. Then comes his retirement in the Wartburg castle, where he worked at his translation of the New Testament. Called from his retreat by the indiscretion of some of his followers he came back to Wittenberg, where he gave prompt and signal token both of his influence as a leader and of his power as a preacher, when in a series of eight sermons he resumed control of the movement, assuaged the tumult of the extremists and steadied the minds of

his friends. Sorely tried in 1525 by the Peasants' War, and by the death of the wise Elector of Saxony (Frederick), he found consolation in his marriage with Katharine von Bora, a former nun. In the family relation he was both good and happy. His home was a comfort to him and a joy to his friends for the rest of his days.

The year 1529 is marked by several memorable events in Luther's life and work: (1) His visitation of the Saxon churches, in which much was done in the settlement of their order and worship, and the unifying of their organization. (2) The issuance of his famous catechisms, which are among the bulwarks of the Lutheran theology. (3) His sad dispute with the Swiss reformer Zwingli over the Lord's Supper. (4) The famous diet of Spire at which the German nobles in sympathy with Luther made, against the unfairness of the papal and imperial side, the Protest which gave an immortal name to the movement. In the next year at Augsburg was presented to the diet the great Confession which defined the Protestant faith. Luther was, for prudential reasons, not permitted to be at Augsburg, but from Coburg, within the Elector's dominions and in easy reach, he kept in touch with the theologians and princes who were at the diet. In this and many other ways he was busy and burdened. Writing, corresponding, teaching, advising, and preaching, he had his heart and hands full of work.

Amid all his labors we must not forget his services to sacred song. He wrote many hymns and tunes, but his immortal paraphrase of the forty-sixth Psalm contains the very essence of his faith and his work: "A mighty fortress is our God."

Luther was far from being satisfied either with himself or his work, and the inevitable drawbacks and disappointments that retarded and damaged the cause of the Reformation were clearly seen and keenly felt. It was natural that he should be weary of life; and his end was fortunate for him, occurring not many months before the disastrous issue of the Smalcald War brought Protestantism to sad straits in Germany.

The story of Luther's end is brief and sweet. In January, 1546, he was invited to Eisleben, his birthplace, to aid in settling a dispute which had arisen between the

counts of Mansfeld. He was successful in this mission, and on a Sunday of his stay there, February 14th, he preached his last sermon. His health had not been very robust for some time, though there was no special illness now upon him. He seems to have caught cold, for the next day after preaching he complained of an oppression about his chest, took his bed and in a few days—February 18, 1546—passed to his reward. It is noteworthy that he should have died away from Wittenberg, and at the little place where, sixty-three years before, he had been born. Friends were with him at the closing scene and tenderly ministered to him. One of these, Justus Jonas, asked him of his faith, and the tried veteran expressed his full trust in Christ as his only hope. And so having quoted the Master's own dying words, "Lord, into thy hands I commit my spirit," he passed peacefully into rest. His body was taken to Wittenberg for burial, and there his body awaits the resurrection, near the chancel of that old castle church, several times damaged and renewed, close to the spot where in his brave youth he had posted his theses and begun the mighty work of his life.

Luther's was by no means a perfect character, but it was a very robust and essentially sound one. The natural man was strong and brave, but somewhat rude and coarse, as his peasant blood and early training would lead us to expect. Yet he was kind-hearted and full of the joy of life. His was that typical German nature in which tender sentiment—love, poetry, music, æsthetic taste—is strangely allied with a coarseness and violence never excusable and sometimes shocking. But this ruder element was not in Luther allied with self-seeking. Overbearing he might be, but he was not selfish. Much that is unpleasant in manner and speech can be forgiven to a man of rugged honesty of purpose and sincerity of conviction. In Luther the regenerate man was not wholly released from the trammels of his clay, but he was truly converted and ever on the way to better things. He was full of the faith he preached; and of love, with a noticeable trace of mysticism; he was mighty in prayer, and even in his busiest and most exacting days did not omit communion with his God. One of his favorite sayings was *Bene orasse est bene studuisse*—to have prayed well

is to have studied well. He was regardful of his friends, and honored them, though observant of their faults and not always very considerate in his criticisms. He was devoted to his people and to his God, and unfaltering in his heroic defence of the truth as he saw it. The tried man stood the test of many a tough encounter. He was often lonely, sad, and disappointed. Though in many minor matters he is far from being beyond criticism, he stood the severest tests of character at every essential point, and towers colossal among the heroes of Christian history. Unbiased judgment will not gainsay the dictum of Carlyle: "I will call this Luther a true great man—great in intellect, in courage, affection, and integrity; one of our most lovable and precious men."

As a preacher Luther stands in the first rank of those who by the ministry of God's Word have moulded the characters and destinies of men. Among all his other offices and achievements—as scholar, theologian, author, and leader—we must not forget that, first of all and chiefly, he was a preacher. At first he could hardly be persuaded to preach, but when he once got at it nothing could stop him.

Like many other great preachers he was great not in any one preëminent thing but in a cluster of excellent qualities. Remember the stages of his development as a preacher: first, his monastic and scholastic preparation up to the time of the theses, during which he was diligently studying the Bible and gradually and unconsciously becoming mentally and spiritually saturated with the doctrines of grace; then his break with Rome and the sharp discovery to himself and the world that he had struck out a new path and was burdened with a message that he must deliver; then the enforced months of Bible study and reflection in the Wartburg; and, finally, the mature closing years, beginning with the triumph at Wittenberg when, in a few powerful sermons, he saved the Reformation from wreck by excess. Add to this discipline of events his natural gifts and character; his strong intellect, his fine imagination, his sympathy with the people, his genial disposition, his courage and honesty; add further his learning, his knowledge of the Bible and theology, his keen insight into men and affairs, his

facility of speech and power of statement; and add above all his experience of grace and his overwhelming earnestness of conviction that he had and must proclaim the truth of God in matters vital to the souls of his fellow-men—and there is presented a sum of elements which could not fail to make him one of the greatest preachers of all time.

When we read Luther's sermons and note the contents of his preaching, in order to do him justice we must read not from our times back to him, but forward from the times preceding up to him. Thus only can we justly appreciate the immense difference between his work and that of the best mediæval preachers, and estimate aright the value of the service which he rendered to the preaching of the gospel. Compare Luther's sermons with those of Bernard, of Antony, of Berthold, of Tauler, and even of Savonarola, the greatest of his mediæval predecessors, and what a difference strikes us! The earlier sermons, before he finally broke with Rome, naturally have more in common with the past. But even in these the grasp and exposition of Scripture are an important element, and traces of the coming evangelical development are discernible. And so in his maturer sermons we are prepared to find the three distinctive qualities of his discourse: (1) Right interpretation and application of Scripture; (2) Christ alone the Saviour; (3) Union with him by faith the only way of salvation. Everything is built on this foundation. The exposition of the Word is sometimes general and sometimes detailed, but not often allegorical or strained. The context is regarded and the real intent and meaning of the Scripture writers is sought and respected. The saints and the Virgin receive their proper place, and Jesus Christ alone is exalted as Saviour, Intercessor and Lord. Works and penances are rightly judged, and faith in Christ is made the central means in salvation. With these essentials firmly laid as a foundation the structure of argument, illustration, attack and defence, elaboration by story, experience, appeal, proceeds. There is no show of learning, and no effort to strike, but everywhere the evident purpose by all subordinate means of speech to bring God's truth home to the hearts and minds of his hearers.

As to the manner and style of Luther's preaching, not much needs to be said. His outlines show no slavery to the analytical method and are often homiletically faulty; he pays but little attention to introduction and conclusion, the body of discourse is the main thing. He often digresses, but usually has a well-defined theme, though not always clearly stated. Sometimes there is a short text and textual division, sometimes the old homily style of verse by verse comment, and sometimes the more analytical treatment of a longer passage as a whole. In rich and racy vernacular speech Luther was a master. He thought with the learned, but he also thought and talked with the people. Often there is lack of elegance, and sometimes downright coarseness, but on the whole his style of speech was clear to the people, warm with life and sentiment, and vigorous with the robust nature of the man himself. He had a free impressive delivery without affectation or violence. He carefully thought out his sermons; indeed was full of thought all the time, and spoke freely without manuscript as the occasion and the circumstances demanded.

The tone and spirit of Luther's preaching were what his character and views would lead us to expect. He believed and therefore he spoke—out of his experience and convictions—out of his sense of duty—out of love to God and men, and without the fear of man before his eyes.

2. FRIENDS AND FOLLOWERS OF LUTHER

In all parts of Germany there were friends and followers of Luther who deserve honorable mention in a history of preaching.¹ Some of these were preachers of a high order of merit themselves, and though they owed much to their great leader were by no means his slavish imitators.

Though Philip Melanchthon (d. 1560) was not a preacher, yet as the intimate friend of Luther, the theologian of the Reformation and the teacher of many preachers, he claims notice here. He wrote two not very important works on preaching. Even Luther could not prevail on him to preach; and it is said that once after

¹ The works of Beste and Schmidt, mentioned in previous note, have been of special use in studying the friends of Luther.

examining two candidates for the ministry he wept and said, "O poor me! who in writing with the pen am not afraid to express my views before the whole empire, yet dare not do what to these is a little thing, speak before even a small congregation of hearers." Yet he lectured with effect to large classes of students, and even composed lecture sermons (postils) for them, which show good powers of composition. But it was as he said: "If preaching were an art merely, I too could preach." He lacked not the powers, but the call.

Decidedly one of the most notable preachers of the Reformation was the beloved pastor at Wittenberg, John Bugenhagen (1485-1558). He received the customary rudiments of education at his native place, Wollin in Pomerania, and his university training at Greifswald, where he stood high and was graduated young. He became a teacher at Treptow, and in 1512 was made a priest and a lecturer in a school of preachers. His exegetical lectures rivalled his sermons in power and popularity.

By the writings of Erasmus and other things he was kept in deep sadness over the decay in doctrine and morals. A little later Luther's tract on the *Babylonish Captivity* fell into his hands, and though he spoke against it at first, a more careful reading convinced him that Luther was right, and he gave in his adhesion to the reformer. He was attracted to Wittenberg, where he could study the new doctrines at the feet of the leader; but soon after his arrival there Luther went to Worms and the Wartburg. During Luther's absence Bugenhagen stood with Melanchthon in opposing the extremes of Carlstadt and others. He also began to lecture on the Psalms to a few of his fellow Pomeranians in his house, but so great was his success that the house would not hold those who came to hear, and he was induced to give his lectures to a wider public.

In 1522 he married Eva Rorer, who proved a good and true helper to him all his life long. In the same year he was appointed pastor and preacher of the town church at Wittenberg. The interesting old building is still there, and near it the homely house which bears an inscription signifying that there John Bugenhagen lived and labored

as pastor for many years. One of his most important works as pastor was to introduce the new order of worship—an event which is recorded on a memorial tablet in the old church near the pulpit where Luther, Bugenhagen, and others of the preachers often stood. Bugenhagen was an excellent pastor and organizer, and in the latter capacity he was frequently called on to visit other places and introduce the new order of worship and church polity. Perhaps no other man—not even Luther, who was not gifted in organization—did as much for the Reformation in this way as Bugenhagen. During these absences Luther preached for him very often and also looked after the pastoral work. He was Luther's confidant, and often cheered and encouraged the reformer in his spells of depression. Being milder and more composed in temper than Luther, and not timid like Melancthon, he was a very necessary third in that great triumvirate. His views of truth and principles of action were heartily in accord with Luther's, and their cordial mutual esteem and appreciation were never broken.

The organizing genius of Bugenhagen were noteworthy successes in establishing Lutheranism in Brunswick, and in Hamburg and Lübeck. From the last place he was sent back home highly honored, and, as a mark of appreciation, in a coach and accompanied by an escort. On the way a young fellow of the escort, one of those refreshingly stupid and meddlesome persons who serve to break the monotony of life, asked Bugenhagen if he thought the Apostle Peter would have been willing to travel in so much style. The answer is worthy of record: "My son, if the Apostle Peter had visited such kind, good people as your masters in Lübeck he would doubtless have permitted himself to be sent away with respect and comfort; but if he had come upon mean fellows like you he would have gone home afoot."

After these visits Bugenhagen for a considerable time went on with his regular work at Wittenberg, preaching, looking after his flock, and giving lectures at the university. In 1533 he was made a doctor. Later, to his great joy, he was invited by the duke to come to his beloved native Pomerania and confirm the Lutheran order in the churches. After this King Christian III. of Denmark

summoned him to Copenhagen to preside over the religious services at his coronation and then organize the churches after the Lutheran order. After these notable labors Bugenhagen returned to Wittenberg and took up his usual work. But soon the shadows began to gather. Luther died; Protestantism was defeated in the field; Wittenberg itself was captured by the imperial forces and passed under the dominion of Maurice of Saxony. Bugenhagen took the position that the new ruler must be accepted and the best possible be made of the untoward change. For this, as well as on some minor theological points, he was sharply criticized by the more extreme Lutherans; ill health and weariness befell him; but in all his trials his brave and patient spirit did not fail. Unterrified by danger, untempted by ambition, he lived his good and active life to the end, and passed away in peace at Wittenberg, in April, 1558.

An able German writer¹ has said: "In the city from which the reformation of the German church was to go forth there were drawn together three men: the first gifted as prophet, the second as teacher, the third as pastor; Luther for Saxony, Melanchthon for Swabia, Bugenhagen for Pomerania." "Dr. Pommer," as Luther sometimes called him, was an excellent scholar, praised by Melanchthon as a *grammaticus*, and was also a sound and popular expounder of the Word of God. As a preacher he was not distinctly great in an oratorical way, falling below Luther, Jonas and others, and even below himself in other respects; yet even here he stood above the common. His preaching was distinguished for its honoring of Christ, its power of exposition, its devout spirit. He loved to preach, and sometimes, in Luther's no doubt just opinion, he kept on too long. Strange that the only remains of his preaching are his funeral discourse at Luther's death, and a sermon in the Pomeranian dialect. Of his other writings there are quite a number. In the printed edition of the funeral sermon for Luther the substance is given, but the personal references are wanting. It is no eulogy, but a strong and sensible discourse of comfort to sorrowing Christians on the noble passage in 1 Thess. 4:13-18, beginning with the

¹ Vogt, quoted by Beste, S. 175.

words, "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others which have no hope." Fitting words from the right man on a momentous occasion, and the discourse is not unworthy of them all.

Next, and very close to the immortal three just mentioned, stood the lovable and eloquent Justus Jonas (d. 1555). He was the son of a burgomaster of Nordhausen, received his early schooling at home, and then studied with distinction at Erfurt and Wittenberg. At first he devoted himself to law, then to theology, and became professor of Holy Scripture and Canon Law at Wittenberg, soon exchanging for the chair of Theology. He was in cordial sympathy with Luther from the first, and stood so close to him in the exciting days at the beginning of the Reformation as to be called "Luther's Jonathan." He accompanied the reformer on his famous journey to Worms, and shared the perils and the triumphs of that great occasion. He was also present at the Marburg colloquy with Zwingli, and in the next year was an influential figure at the Augsburg diet, where the Confession of Faith was put forth. In 1539 Jonas, with Luther and others, at the invitation of Duke Henry, organized the Lutheran church in the duchy of Saxony—at that time, as often before and since, distinct from the electorate. Two years later he was called to Halle to be pastor, not having yet been ordained as preacher, and there, in the old Marienkirche, which still stands in mediæval grandeur, one of the most conspicuous buildings of the town, Jonas preached his first sermon. He was granted leave of absence from his chair at Wittenberg for four years, and these he so successfully filled with labors as pastor and preacher that at the expiration of his leave his flock protested against his departure and he was allowed to remain, being probably released from his professorship. Luther often visited him at Halle, and coming by on that last journey to Eisleben was accompanied by his tried friend to what proved to be his death scene. It was Jonas who stood by the dying hero, asked him if he would die by the principles he had taught, and received his emphatic "Yes." He conducted the first funeral services over Luther at Eisleben, and afterwards

delivered a memorial discourse at Halle. The fatal Smalcald War brought great trials to Jonas. Halle was taken by the emperor's army, and a Spanish soldier was instructed to kill the preacher, but the man's heart failed him, and the faithful pastor escaped. He fled and underwent many vicissitudes. In his last years he was Superintendent of the Lutheran churches in the principality of Coburg and died at Eisfeld in 1555.

In comparing him with others Melanchthon said, " Bugenhagen is a grammarian (scholar), I a logician, Jonas an orator, and Luther is all in all." Only a few of his sermons remain in print, but they are worth reading. While not so impressive a speaker as Luther, he was a preacher of excellent merit. His sermons exhibit forcible argumentation, accurate knowledge and interpretation of Scripture, a sound gospel, with a warm nature, good imagination and a lively and vigorous style.

Caspar Aquila (Adler, d. 1560) was one of the younger friends and pupils of Luther. He was of a vehement, though not inconstant nature. He not only filled several pastorates with distinction, but was at Wittenberg one of the scholars who lent valuable service in the translation of the Scriptures. Like others he suffered for his zeal and courage when the issue of the Smalcald War went against the reformers. Charles V. is said to have offered a reward for the bold and fiery man.

As we should expect from his character, Aquila was a warm, soulful preacher. Thoroughly grounded in the Scriptures and filled with Luther's doctrine, he preached with glowing zeal and some indiscretion against the papacy and the Romish errors, but he also knew how to speak words of tenderness to needy souls and set forth the truth of the gospel in clear and forcible expression. In the rhetorical matter of division and order he is more exact and careful than Luther and Jonas, while his style, like theirs, is picturesque and popular.

In South Germany one of the noblest leaders in the Reformation cause was the judicious and faithful John Brentz (1499-1570), who came of respectable and pious parents in a small town of the modern Württemberg, then Swabia. As a student from early years he showed both intellect and diligence. At the University of Heidel-

berg Œcolampadius was one of his teachers, and among his fellow-students were Martin Butzer and Philip Melanchthon. His sympathies were with Luther from the start, and when he began to teach at Heidelberg, though not a priest or preacher, he could not keep off the theological questions of the time and began to lecture on Matthew. Objection was made, and he was ordained priest, but with undisguised evangelical views. Soon he received a call to be pastor at Hall, an important Swabian town to the northeast of Stuttgart. Here for a long time he worked as a pastor, beloved and strong. He gradually, and with great wisdom and moderation, led his people into reformation views and order, doing away with the mass in 1525. He earnestly opposed the Peasants' War, but was moderate in actions against it. He agreed with Luther as against Zwingli and Œcolampadius as to the Lord's Supper, was at the Marburg Conference, and also at Augsburg when the Confession was published. At the request of the duke of the country Brentz helped to reform the University of Tübingen in a Lutheran sense. The defeat of the Protestant rulers in the Smalcald War brought suffering to Brentz and others. He had to hide, and so near were the imperial troops to finding him once that their lances nearly pierced him as they were thrusting about in the straw or brush which concealed him. It is also told of him—as of some others in similar circumstances—that he was kept from starvation by the good offices of a hen who laid an egg near him every day. He escaped, however, to safer places; and when better times came back he was called to be the leading Lutheran preacher at Stuttgart, where he fulfilled an able and blessed ministry for many years, though not without many trials and sorrows, and died in September, 1570, outliving many of his old companions.

The preaching of Brentz was full of Scripture. He made exposition the principal thing, and in a time of so much theological controversy, in which he bore no little or unworthy part, he yet preached much upon Christian duty and morals. For this he was warmly praised by Luther. As a man he was distinguished for his purity, courage, moderation and fidelity, while his admirable modesty and unselfish desire for the good of his people won for him the confidence and love of men.

Among the younger men who were gathered about Luther a place of honor belongs to Veit (Vitus) Dietrich (1506-1549). He was of humble origin, being the son of a poor shoemaker at Nuremberg. But his promise was observed by friends, and he came to Wittenberg to study, supported by the council of his native town. His attention to study was notable, as well as his amiability and cheerfulness. He was an inmate of Luther's own home, and was brought into admiring intimacy with both Luther and Melanchthon.

While Luther was at Coburg in 1530 watching the proceedings of the famous diet of Augsburg, Dietrich was his tried and helpful companion. In those anxious days the ready cheerfulness and busy and tactful service of his young friend were a great comfort to the heavily burdened reformer. Dietrich's letters to Melanchthon and to Luther's wife present a valuable picture of the great man's fortitude and prayerfulness during the mental and bodily strain of that trying time.

After teaching awhile at Wittenberg Dietrich became pastor of a church at his native town of Nuremberg. The elder Osiander was pastor of the leading church here. He was involved in some controversies, and was, though an able preacher, not a very lovable man. His preaching was rather of the ambitious sort and soared over the heads of the people. Dietrich's more simple nature and his easy, popular style, addressing itself to the children and the poor, were a strong contrast to those of the older man. The consequences are easily surmised—the crowd followed Dietrich, and the jealousy of Osiander was aroused. He made it in various ways unpleasant for Dietrich, but Melanchthon bears emphatic testimony to the admirable patience and humility of his friend under these trials.

Dietrich's sermons are clear, simple, and sweet. The analysis is plain, the language easy, and the spirit devout. Besides his own work he has laid posterity under obligations by his report of Luther's *Hauspostillen*, or "Home Talks," and as these differ considerably from the reports of another auditor it is reasonable to suppose that they reflect a good deal of Dietrich as well as of Luther. Specially worthy of mention is his loving effort to reach

the children in his sermons, and well does Beste say of him:¹ "His sermons are the testimonies of a witness who had turned the doctrines of the Reformers into sap and blood, and for that very reason could speak in the most childlike simplicity. They accordingly deserve in the fullest sense the name of children's sermons. Without Luther's fiery spirit they are yet alive with Luther's light and warmth."

There were many other Lutheran preachers of this early period who spread the principles of the Reformation in various parts of Germany. There was the polemic and lofty Andrew Osiander at Nuremberg, the poetic, warm-hearted John Spangenberg, who in several different pastorates gave his clear and popular sermons; Nicholas von Amsdorf, highly esteemed as man and preacher by both Luther and Melanchthon, though somewhat extreme and imprudent; Anton Corvinus, whose short, vigorous sermons won Luther's warm praise, and whose sufferings and toils for the truth were equal to those of any of his brethren; John Mathesius, the modest, retiring teacher and beloved pastor at Joachimsthal, in Bohemia, whose eulogy upon Luther is one of the best sources for the life of the great man; and George Major, who as a boy at Wittenberg enjoyed the love and confidence of the older leaders, heard their discourses, profited by their instructions, and became one of the leading preachers of the Reformation in several different places, notably in that old castle church at Wittenberg, where the theses were posted, and where are the tombs of Luther and Melanchthon.

3. CONDITIONS PREPARATORY TO THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND

In the latter part of the fifteenth century there existed in Switzerland conditions which had an important bearing on the course of the Reformation and the character of preaching in that country. The pride and independence of the Swiss had been greatly increased by their recent notable military achievements in Italy and against Austria. But the demoralization of the country was sadly aided by the system of hiring out the brave Swiss soldiers

¹ *Op cit.*, S. 293.

to fight the battles of other lands than their own. The church and clergy in Switzerland were as corrupt as elsewhere, and offered little or no help against this national deterioration. Yet there were some faithful priests and other pious persons who warned against the state of things. Among these was the famous Felix Hemmerlin of Zürich, one of the canons at the Grossmünster, who wrote against many of the existing evils, and his works had considerable circulation. The political independence of the Swiss made them restive if too much pressure was brought to bear on them by church authorities. The failure of the church to institute needed reforms caused the authorities, municipal or aristocratic, as the case might be, to take hold of some of the worst evils and make regulations in the interests of religion and morality. There was a tendency also toward municipal control of church revenues, and in other ways toward giving to the civil authorities a large share in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs. When we add to all this that, through Erasmus and others, the Humanistic movement, with its criticisms of the church, was more or less prevalent in Switzerland, we trace many of the causes which gave encouragement and stimulus to the great work of Zwingli and the rest.

4. ZWINGLI AND HIS FRIENDS AT ZÜRICH

All these preparatory influences were more or less apparent in Zürich, the important and vigorous town which was to become the main center of reformatory activity in Switzerland. Here, in the yet standing Grossmünster, in January, 1519, the great Swiss reformer began his work.

Huldreich [Ulrich] Zwingli¹ was born on New Year's Day, 1484, at Wildhaus, in the mountainous and lofty district of Toggenburg. His parents belonged to an old and respectable family of plain, honest people. Huldreich was the third among ten children. The talents and promise of the boy early attracted notice, and his father

¹ Authorities chiefly used: Rudolf Stähelin, *Huldreich Zwingli, sein Leben und Wirken*; the same author's article in Herzog; article by Prof. Egli of Zürich in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*; Zwingli's *Werke*, Bde. I. & II., by Schuler and Schultess. I have also consulted S. M. Jackson's valuable *Huldreich Zwingli*.

designed him for the church. It was well for the lad that his excellent uncle, Bartholomew Zwingli, was parish priest in a neighboring community. By his advice Huldreich was sent to a good school at Basel, where he remained three years, and thence went to Bern. Like Luther, Zwingli was not only a diligent and brilliant student, but was also a musician, played and sang well, and greatly delighted in the art. Having completed his preparatory studies, the young scholar was advised to go to the University of Vienna, which was then much under the Humanistic influence. Here he studied for awhile, but returned to Basel to take his degrees in regular course, where, along with his university studies, he also taught in a school. Here he formed his enduring friendship with Leo Jud, who shared both his scholarly and his musical tastes.

An event of importance to both these young men was the coming of Thomas Wyttenbach to teach and preach at Basel, in 1505. This man exerted a deep and lasting influence on Zwingli. He was an excellent teacher, and, along with his zeal for culture, he also held religious views which lay in the direction of reform. The main thing was that he emphasized the Word of God as the chief authority in matters of faith. He also exposed the abuse of indulgences, and possibly attacked other errors.

In 1506, having completed his university course, Zwingli was ready for his life-work and was called to be parish priest at Glarus, a town of considerable importance. Before going to his charge he preached his first sermon at Rapperswyl, a place on the shores of Lake Zürich, and read his first mass in his native village. At Glarus Zwingli lived and worked for ten years. He felt from the first the responsibilities of his position, and conscientiously labored to meet them. Though not yet deeply spiritual he gradually made progress, both in the life of piety and in reformatory views of Christian truth. He was no scholastic recluse on the one hand, fond as he was of books and learning; nor, on the other, did he allow the social and administrative functions of his office to divert his attention from his studies. He accumulated books and worked hard upon them. But the crown and core of all his studies was the Bible. In 1513, without

a teacher, he began the study of Greek¹ in order to get his knowledge of the New Testament directly from the original. As a natural result of his study of the Scriptures he already began to give them the chief place in his preaching, though not as yet were the scholastic and traditional Catholic elements put aside.

On the social and pastoral side of his life Zwingli was equally active. By nature he was jovial and sociable, made friends easily and kept them. He moved freely among the people, was interested in their life both as pastor and man, and learned their ways of thought and speech. Zwingli loved his country and shared the warlike spirit of his race. But he was, like other thoughtful patriots, opposed both on moral and patriotic grounds to the practice of mercenary warfare. But though opposed to it, yet, as a Catholic and patriot, he accompanied, in the capacity of chaplain, the Swiss troops who fought for the pope against Francis I. of France in 1515. He witnessed the bloody battle of Marignano, where some Swiss fought on both sides, and where the papal army was defeated. More than ever disgusted with mercenary warfare, and having now larger knowledge of life and men, including some insight into papal affairs, the young priest came home to Glarus to resume his pastoral work. But in the summer of 1516 he left Glarus and accepted a call to Einsiedeln.

During his two years' work at Einsiedeln Zwingli made important progress in his development as a reformer. Then, as now, the place was a noted shrine for pilgrimages, because of the possession of an ancient image of the Virgin, which was said to work miracles. Thus the place was a center for Romish superstition and for the Catholic teaching as to merits, indulgences and the like. The hollowness of it all was deeply impressed upon the young preacher's mind. He was prudent enough not to attack these things directly, but he opposed to them the preaching of the gospel of grace and redemption in Christ alone. Not only in his own mind did the evangelical sentiments grow, but he was enabled to impress them upon the many pilgrims who came to Einsiedeln. His

¹ It seems strange that neither at Basel nor Vienna as late as Zwingli's time was Greek a part of the curriculum for the academic degrees.

power in the pulpit was unquestionable, and his name, and to some extent his teachings, were made known in many parts of the country by those who had heard him at Einsiedeln.

In the spiritual life his case was a peculiar one. He had no clearly defined conversion like Augustine's, no such heart struggles as Luther, and never had the spiritual and mystical tone which marked both those great men. Zwingli's was rather a gradual growth in spiritual and moral power, chiefly led by the intellectual apprehension of the evangelical doctrines. Thus we cannot date his actual conversion. Before going to Zürich he had not been wholly free from certain lapses from virtue only too common among the priests of his time. But with shame and genuine contrition he mourned his few falls, fought his weakness, and at length, through grace, overcame. He had no sophistical excuses to make, but a manly determination to conquer.

The appearance of Erasmus' edition of the Greek Testament in the spring of 1516 was a great event for Zwingli—as for the world. He got a copy just before leaving Glarus, and at Einsiedeln he made a loving and earnest study of it. Among other methods of study he copied out in Greek the epistles of Paul, in order to impress the language more on his mind. As a preacher he grew in power steadily with his theological and spiritual growth. And so, at the end of two years and a few months at Einsiedeln, he was ready for his life work at Zürich.

In a political sense the city of Zürich was at the time practically free and self-governed. It had control over the canton of the same name, and by having joined in 1351 the four forest cantons—Uri, Schwytz, Underwalden, and Lucerne—it had become an influential member of the Swiss Confederation, in some respects the most important. It was thus fitted to be the center of the Reformation for German Switzerland. In ecclesiastical matters there was also considerable freedom. The two leading churches, the Grossmünster and the Frauenmünster—both dating from the ninth century—were the seats of ecclesiastical foundations that had acquired a great degree of independence in the management of their own affairs.

The city also had gradually gained considerable power in regulating the churches, both in regard to the selection of the canons and the disposal of funds. But, while these conditions were just such as a true leader could make the most of for introducing reformatory principles, the moral and religious state of Zürich was a fearful drawback. Hemmerlin had lifted up his voice against the demoralization of people and clergy, but he had been sorely persecuted for his fidelity and put in jail. The people were outwardly attached to the old faith and to the pope, and there was little real spiritual or moral basis, either in clergy or people, on which to build a true reformation in religion. Yet there was some. The devout and pious were found in Zürich also, and some who felt on humanistic grounds a hearty disgust with the disgraceful corruptions of the time.

On Saturday, January 1, 1519, his birthday, Huldreich Zwingli began his eventful work as "popular priest," or pastor, of the Grossmünster church at Zürich. It was an event for history. He announced to the assembled canons on that day that he would begin his preaching the next day with a course of expository sermons on the Gospel of Matthew, taking the book straight through without regard to the appointed lessons of the church service. This announcement created a stir, but the congregation gathered on Sunday with heightened interest to hear the new preacher and the new method. Success was assured from the start. The people came in unwonted numbers, and the preacher's hold upon the minds and hearts of his hearers was immediate and firm. Distinctly thus the Swiss Reformation began with the preaching of the Word of God. Zwingli afterwards explained the reason for his course in his letter of self-defence, addressed to the bishop of Constance, in 1522. He said he began with Matthew in order to make his people acquainted directly with the work and teaching of Jesus. He then expounded the Acts in a similar way to show how the early church was established on Christ's foundations. Next he took the Epistles to the Galatians and to Timothy to set forth Paul's views of fundamental doctrine and church order; and then those of Peter to show how that apostle agreed with Paul. At the time

of writing his defence he was expounding the Epistle to the Hebrews that the congregation "might be led to Christ as the true High Priest and only Mediator between God and men, and might be still clearly taught concerning his saving work and glory."

In the course of this year, 1519, the plague visited Zürich, and its ravages were fearful. Zwingli was away when the epidemic broke out, but promptly returned to his post and faithfully performed his arduous pastoral duties in that struggle with death. The loss of friends, of his younger brother Andrew, who lived with him, and his own serious illness, made a deep impression on the spiritual life of Zwingli, and his brave devotion to his duties in that time of trial made him more than ever dear to the people.

In this same eventful year the work of Luther began to influence Zwingli. Hitherto his development and work as a reformer had been independent of the great Saxon. Luther's Leipzig disputation with Eck in the summer of 1519 gave Zwingli great joy and encouragement. And when, in the next year, the papal bull against Luther was issued Zwingli prevented its publication in Zürich. He unhesitatingly stood with Luther and applauded his course, though he foresaw that this decisive step meant, not only for Luther himself, but for his sympathizers everywhere, separation from Rome. He went on with his preaching, and without much outward opposition attacked yet more clearly and earnestly both the bad moral condition of the church and also many of its doctrines, as purgatory, the intercession of saints, the legends of the saints, the authority of the pope, and especially monasticism.

An event, considered by many as the decisive point in the severance of Zwingli's relations to Rome, befell in the year 1522. Some of his people exercised their Christian liberty by eating meat on a fast day. Zwingli felt that they were somewhat precipitate, but when they were called to account before the authorities for their breach of discipline he defended their course, and this led to his preaching and publishing, in March, 1522, a sermon on Christian liberty in matters of detail. In this he not only questioned the whole matter of fasts as being without

Scriptural foundation, but showed the worthlessness of external works in general.

Zwingli soon determined on a bold stroke. At his suggestion the council of the city issued a call for a great public disputation, to be held at Zürich on the 29th of January, 1523, to consider all the questions in dispute between the reformers and their opponents. The invitation was made very general, but only a few from beyond Zürich and vicinity came. Faber was there, with a small following, representing the bishop of Constance, but the friends of Zwingli were numerous present. He himself appeared with sixty-seven propositions which he had published and proposed to defend. There was really no discussion to speak of. Zwingli had it all his own way. Faber contented himself with denying the right of the city council of Zürich to pass on such questions, asserting the supremacy of the church and the pope, and making other such shifts. The disputation came to an end by noon; and in the afternoon the council passed and recorded a minute to the effect that as Zwingli had not been shown to be in error, he should go on unmolested in his preaching of the Word of God as he had been doing; and, further, that other preachers in the region should preach only what could be proved by Scripture, and that the term heretic should cease to be applied to those who pursued this course.

Reforms in the order of worship took place. One by one the Catholic ceremonies disappeared, making place for the simpler rites of the reformed service. Finally the mass was abolished, and the simpler celebration of the Lord's Supper in the Reformed manner, and according to the New Testament design, was substituted at Easter, 1525. This date and event may be taken as the culmination of Zwingli's work as a reformer, but the strifes and trials of his closing years must be at least briefly recalled that the story of his life may not be incomplete.

Among the followers of Zwingli was a group of men—some of them men of culture—who, though agreeing with him in his opposition to Rome, felt that his reforms did not go far enough, or sufficiently reproduce the doctrines and practices of the apostolic churches. They be-

lieved that the State-Church system was wrong, and came to disbelieve in infant baptism. This led to the view that persons who had received that rite in infancy should, on professing faith in their maturer years, receive baptism. Hence they were called Anabaptists, or re-baptizers. In regard to the separation of church and state, Zwingli was unalterably opposed to their views. But on the question of infant baptism he was at first disposed to agree with them, only counselling moderation and patience. But the Anabaptists would not keep still, and being, no doubt, somewhat rash, they were put in the attitude of disturbers of the peace and opponents of the lawful authorities. So at last they were put under the ban, and some of them were condemned and executed. This persecution remains a sad blot on Zwingli's career; but we must remember that these men seemed to him and the Zürich authorities dangerous agitators as well as heretics.

The suppression of the Anabaptists showed Zwingli's power in Zürich and his firm adherence to his principles of a State-Church, but it cost him much trial and sorrow, and neither the extreme measures employed nor the repression of liberty of conscience can be justified. Along with this controversy came the peasant uprising, which affected Switzerland as well as Germany. Zwingli sympathized in part with the peasants, urging the granting of some of their claims, counselled moderation both to them and the civil authorities, and thus secured the ending of the trouble in Switzerland without bloodshed.

Parallel with these troubles was the painful and unfortunate difference between Zwingli and Luther over the Lord's Supper. The controversy began in 1524 and was carried on for some time by writings. Zwingli was firmly persuaded of the soundness of his own views, but was ready to tolerate differences in others if they could hold together in common opposition to Rome. The discussion showed that agreement was impossible; but Zwingli tearfully offered the hand of brotherly love, hoping that they might agree to disagree on this theologically important but practically secondary matter while they were at one in their acceptance of Scripture and rejection of Catholicism. But Luther looked upon such

compromise as a betrayal of truth, and declined Zwingli's generous overtures. This was a most unfortunate episode, but in it Zwingli shows to better advantage than Luther.

The third and fatal strife in which Zwingli was involved was of a political as well as religious nature. The five Swiss cantons of Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Lucerne and Zug—the first four being the famous heart of the old Swiss Confederacy—remained firmly Catholic, while Bern, Glarus, and others followed the lead of Zürich and became Reformed. The five Catholic cantons, though weaker than the others in wealth and population, had a preponderating influence in the Swiss diet, and used their advantage against the Reformed views. The matter finally came to blows. The Reformed cantons were somehow unprepared to act in concert, and the delay was promptly utilized by the Catholics. Zürich saw the attacking army almost at her doors and hastily sent an inadequate force into the field. Zwingli foresaw the inevitable defeat, but he bravely accompanied the troops and encouraged them. The fight occurred at Cappel, a town lying between Zürich and Zug, Nov. 11, 1531. The Zürichers were outnumbered and defeated, and Zwingli fell on the field, sword in hand.

The character of Zwingli and the nature of his work of reform were in many respects quite different from those of the other great reformers. His religious life was not so deep or pure as that of either Luther or Calvin, yet it was sincere and strong. His conscientious devotion to duty was marked from the first, and as his knowledge of the gospel grew and strengthened his personal experience of its saving power likewise increased. With him the humanistic, moral, intellectual side of reform was in the lead; and the political bent of his mind was stamped on his measures both by his ardent patriotism and by the character of the place, institutions and people with which he had to deal.

As a preacher Zwingli must occupy a high place in history. Preaching with him, as with Luther, was the main thing, and by it chiefly he gained and kept his hold upon the people and carried out his work of reform. He made it his aim from his first work in Glarus to

bring the Word of God home to the people by preaching, and this early resolve only grew with his growth and became the central thing in his life and work.

In form and method of preaching Zwingli was little influenced by scholasticism, and accordingly did not much value analysis. The order of thought was more like that of the classic discourse—showing the influence of his humanistic studies. In language his preaching was popular, clear, and moving. He had less imagination and feeling than Luther, perhaps more than Calvin. But it is not so easy to judge of Zwingli as of the others, because few of his sermons have come down to us. He preached without notes, rarely wrote out for publication, and his sermons were not reported. But the traditional accounts of his methods and power all testify to his wonderful ability in the pulpit. He had a tall, strong figure, a pleasing face and manner, but no great voice. Yet he had that magnetic influence which is ever characteristic of the true orator—people loved to hear him, and were profoundly influenced by what he said. He himself was genuinely surprised by his large congregations, and his friends marvelled at the notable reformation accomplished by his preaching in Zürich. The composite nature of his character and work are fitly set forth in the noble bronze statue back of the old Wasserkirche in Zürich, which represents him standing with upturned face and holding a sword in one hand, a Bible in the other.

Among the assistants and followers of Zwingli at Zürich we notice briefly only the two most important ones—Jud and Bullinger.

Leo Jud,¹ or Judæ (d. 1542), was born at a small town of Alsace in 1482. He was the son of the parish priest, who, like some others, in defiance of the rule of celibacy, lived in an acknowledged relation that was really, though not lawfully, marriage with a woman of respectable family. The name Jud, or Judä, indicates descent (which was remote) from the stock of Israel. The boy Leo was sent to school and enjoyed excellent instruction, not only in the classics, but in morals, from a teacher of character

¹ Good account of Jud in the excellent series, *Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Gründer der Reformirten Kirche*. The sketch of Jud is by Carl Pestalozzi, nephew of the great educator.

and talents. Among his school friends was Martin Butzer, who was to be the famous Strasburg reformer of later days. Leo inclined to the study of medicine, and took employment with an apothecary in Basel, at the same time attending lectures at the university. But the humanistic and theological bent of his tastes triumphed over the medical, and he took the regular degrees in course. It was at Basel, as we have seen, that he formed with Zwingli the friendship so important to the lives of both. During the latter part of his course Jud was made a deacon of St. Theodore's church in Basel, and later was ordained parish priest at St. Hippolyte, in his native Alsace. Here he did faithful service for a number of years, preparing both himself and his people for the new life that was so soon to come in the religious world. He and Zwingli kept up correspondence and mutual affection, and so we are not surprised that when Zwingli went, in 1519, to Zürich he should have recommended Leo as his successor at Einsiedeln. Here accordingly Jud next lived, and for four years followed in his friend's footsteps, progressing in learning and grace while preaching much and boldly the new doctrines.

It was a great joy to Zwingli when, a vacancy occurring at St. Peter's Church in Zürich, he could again use his influence and secure his friend's election to the pastorate there. So Jud came to take charge of his new and what proved to be his lifelong office in February, 1523. At Zürich he stood manfully by Zwingli in all the work and trials incident to introducing the Reformation. Nor was he simply an echo of his friend. He had courage and views of his own, was a faithful pastor, an attractive and instructive preacher, a lovable and pious man, a diligent and laborious scholar. One of his greatest services was his translations, especially of the Bible. He and others labored at this, using, but not exactly reproducing, Luther's work. Indeed before Luther had finished the Old Testament, Jud had translated some of the books, and the first copy of the entire Bible in German was printed at Zürich, ahead of the Wittenberg version.

The death of Zwingli was not only a deep personal affliction to Jud, but he saw in that catastrophe the serious peril of the great work of the Reformation. Fear,

reaction, the opposition at Zürich and elsewhere, made a combination of circumstances that well might appall the stoutest heart. Sadly but bravely Leo stood by his post in that mournful crisis; suffered and endured much, and helped no little to rescue and establish on enduring foundations the imperilled work. He was deeply concerned that a suitable successor to Zwingli should be found. He favored the call to Œcolampadius, who declined; with excellent good sense and modesty he refused to be considered for the vacant place himself; and earnestly advised the Zürich council to elect the young and promising Henry Bullinger. This was done, and when Bullinger came Jud gave to the younger leader cordial support and deference, as he had done to Zwingli.

Struggling with opposition, with poverty, with bodily weakness, the heroic little man toiled on to the end, and died, greatly beloved and mourned by his friends, June 19, 1542.

Many writings, but few sermons, survived him. He preached extempore, expounded ably, warned faithfully, but lovingly; attacked boldly, but not violently; spoke with ease and clearness, and, while not a preacher of pre-eminent gifts, was heard with interest and profit. Zwingli said of him in a letter to Myconius on Jud's election to St. Peter's: "Soon will be there the lion with the mighty voice and the heart thirsting for righteousness; small indeed of person, but full of heroic courage." And his son, gathering some accounts of his life, said of his preaching: "His sermons were buttered and salted. Yet often he complained that when he had with great earnestness attacked great vices and weighty sins, he had not met with success. The cause might well lie in this, that he was by nature so kind, mild and friendly a man. I have also understood from excellent citizens that no sermons succeeded with him better than those on Christian love."

The accomplished, able and highly successful follower of Zwingli in carrying out the work of reformation at Zürich was Henry Bullinger¹ (1504-1575). He was born at Bremgarten, near Zürich, July 18th, 1504, the son of a priest who, like Leo Jud's father and others, lived in otherwise honorable, though ecclesiastically forbidden,

¹ *Väter und Gründer, u. s. w.* His life also by Pestalozzi.

wedlock. In fact many congregations in Switzerland, and perhaps elsewhere, preferred to tolerate this breach of church rules rather than endure worse evils in a celibate priesthood. And so this married priest was beloved by his congregation, and was a good husband and father. Of the other sons there is no need here to speak. Henry showed early promise, both in mind and character, and was carefully taught by his parents and his grandmother and in the local schools. At twelve years of age he was sent to Emmerich, in Germany, to a good school, and later he attended the famous old High School at Cologne. Here, about 1520, Bullinger began the study of theology, just at the time when the strife over Luther's reformatory work at Wittenberg was at its height. What with his reading of the early church fathers, Luther's and Melancthon's writings, and most of all the Bible, Bullinger soon became satisfied that Luther was right. But he did not pass from the old faith to the new without regret and struggle. Coming home from Cologne, he spent a quiet year at his father's house in Bremgarten, deepening his knowledge and his convictions. Then he was schoolmaster at Cappel for six years. He did not become a priest in the old church, for he could not conscientiously celebrate mass. But he attended church for the prayers and the sermon; and both privately and in his school taught reform doctrines. Bullinger attended the disputations at Zürich in January and in October, 1527. Later he heard Zwingli preach and made his personal acquaintance. Soon Bullinger's work began to tell at Cappel, and before a great while the church and abbey there were reformed. The mass having been done away with and a synod of Reformed ministers established, the way was open for Bullinger to take up the work of preaching, which he did along with his school duties. Meantime he became engaged to a sensible and lovely young lady at Zürich. His letter to her proposing marriage is preserved, and does credit to his sense, candor and tenderness. After a long betrothal they were married, and the union was a happy one for life.

In 1529 the elder Bullinger at Bremgarten declared in favor of the Reformed opinions, and after a sharp struggle the adherents of Rome gained the day and he had to

give up his charge. But the Reformed element recovered strength, gained the majority and called the son to be pastor in his father's place. Here he labored for two years; but the war which ended so disastrously for Zürich at Cappel drove Bullinger from home and he received hospitable entertainment at the house of a friend in Zürich. He was there when the defeat of the Zürichers and the death of Zwingli threw the city into consternation and the work of reform into danger.

The great question of a suitable successor to Zwingli was seriously agitating the council and the people. Œcolampadius declined to leave Basel, Leo Jud wisely rejected the overtures made to him, and urged the council to choose Bullinger. He was invited to preach, and his sermons made a deep impression. His election followed, in December, 1531.

In announcing Bullinger's election to the ministers assembled before it, the council took occasion to define their duties, and among items to which no reasonable exception could be taken made some conditions which were a distinct repression of the "freedom of prophesying." They bade the ministers in their rebuke of sin not to use harsh words, and, further, to keep off the ground of civil affairs; in other words, to refrain from criticising the government. Bullinger arose in the painful silence with which the preachers heard this restriction proclaimed, thanked the council in fitting terms for the great honor conferred upon him, agreed cordially with most of what had been laid down as to the duties of the clergy, but said he could not accept the great place offered him without a clearer understanding of exactly what was meant by that fourth article in the council's ordinance as to preaching. He asked for time to consult with his brethren and give his answer at a future meeting. It was granted, the consultation showed the unanimous and proper feeling of the preachers that they could not work under such restriction upon their freedom, and Bullinger, at the proper time, laid the matter before the council in an able speech, in which he showed that the regulation was contrary to Scripture and to sound policy; and distinctly declared he could not accept the place of leader unless the objectionable clauses were modified. Nothing could have

shown more clearly Bullinger's fitness for leadership than the promptness, wisdom, firmness and moderation with which he met this first and severe test. The council was seriously divided; the debate was long and anxious, but the majority came to see that to insist on their course would be, not only to lose Bullinger, but Jud and others, and that this meant, at that terrible crisis of reaction and despondency, nothing less than the ruin of the cause of reformation. To their credit they receded, contenting themselves with advice instead of regulation on the points involved. Bullinger then accepted the office of preacher at the Grossmünster and leader of the Reformed churches in Zürich.

He thus began his difficult and enormous labors with a victory for the cause of truth, and all his after conduct was of a piece with this. Wise, patient, courageous, but not fiery and rash, he was the very man to follow the more strong and impetuous Zwingli, and build slowly and surely on the foundations which that splendid leader had laid. Long and arduous were his labors. There was much in Zwingli's work at Zürich that needed completion, and somewhat that needed improvement; and the general interests required great wisdom and exacting labors. But Henry Bullinger was the man for the occasion. His correspondence with Protestant leaders all over Europe, his oversight and counsel more especially toward the Swiss churches, his administration of the difficult affairs in Zürich, his numerous writings and continued studies, his faithfully performed pastoral and pulpit duties, and no less thoughtful and tender concern for his home and his friends, filled and burdened a long and noble life. He suffered great pains in his last and long illness, but bore them with Christian fortitude, till God gave him release on September 17, 1575.

As a preacher Bullinger deserves more than passing notice. Tall of form, with a flowing beard, a benevolent and intellectual expression, a pleasing voice, a dignified yet animated bearing, he had good external qualifications for public speech. His preaching, like that of the other reformers, was chiefly expository. In the first year of his pastorate he preached series of discourses on Hebrews, the Epistle of Peter, and the Gospel of John; and in the

first ten years he had gone through nearly all the books of the Bible. His diligence and fruitfulness, especially when his other labors are remembered, were simply amazing. He often preached six, and sometimes seven and eight, times a week. When Leo Jud broke down under similar labors the council became alarmed for Bullinger also, gave him an assistant, and requested him to preach only twice a week. His biographer enumerates as having come down from the eighteen years following 1549 one hundred sermons on the book of Revelation, sixty-six on Daniel, one hundred and seventy on Jeremiah, one hundred and ninety on Isaiah, twenty-four fast sermons, and a great number of single discourses. Besides these and other published sermons there were, of course, a great many more. Many of his sermons were published in Latin for preachers beyond the home land, and others in the queer old Swiss German of the time. Some of them were translated into other tongues. He preached in the simple language of the people, without oratorical effort, but with warmth and earnestness, with sincere effort to bring God's truth home to the understandings and the hearts of his hearers. Thus for many years he held a firm grasp on his congregation and was listened to with interest, respect and reverence to the end of his laborious and faithful ministry. God be praised for the lives and works of such men as Henry Bullinger!

There were other preachers at Zürich and vicinity besides the leaders who have been named, but we must turn to the two other important centers of reform influence in German Switzerland and give brief account of the leading preachers.

5. REFORMERS AT BASEL AND BERN

Basel (French Bâle) is an important city on the Rhine and near the French border. Noted as a fortress in the time of the Roman empire, it received its name, "The Royal." During the Middle Ages it had a checkered history as an imperial city. It was devastated by plague and earthquake, but survived and grew strong. Here, in the sad fourteenth century, the noisy Flagellants wept and beat themselves, and here, too, pious mystics like Nicholas and other "Friends of God" found home and influ-

ence. Here also during the fifteenth century one of the famous so-called Reforming Councils held its long and mostly futile sessions. The revival of learning found welcome in Basel in the circles that gathered first about Reuchlin and later about Erasmus, and some noted printers and publishers fostered this literary distinction. In 1501 Basel took the memorable and decisive step of joining the Swiss Federation; this brought and confirmed larger freedom in both civil and ecclesiastical affairs, making it possible for the city government, as at Zürich, to have large share in shaping the course of events in religious history. In 1513 the great scholar Erasmus made his first visit to Basel to see the publisher Froben (Frobenius) in regard to publishing one of his works, and hither, off and on, he came for the rest of his wandering life, till he died and was buried here in 1536. The great event for Erasmus, Froben, Basel, and the world, was the publication of the first complete printed edition of the Greek Testament in 1516. In Basel, too, in those stirring early years of the sixteenth century, Thomas Wyttenbach taught, and Zwingli, Leo Jud, Pellican, Glarean, Capito, Grynæus, and other scholars noted in Reformation history, spent busy and fruitful school days. Thus at Basel, along with the usual hindrances, were various lines of influence that might be gathered and used for the Reformation if the right man came on the scene as leader. And he did, in the person of John Œcolampadius (1482-1531).

In the little town of Weinsberg, in the present Kingdom of Württemberg, lived a good and respectable citizen and merchant named Hüssgen, some say Hausschein. To him and his pious and sensible wife sons were born, but only one survived. The boy received in baptism the name of John, but in after days, according to the absurd humanistic fashion then so affected, translated or perverted his German family name into the high-sounding Greek Œcolampadius, by which he is known in history.¹

Born in 1482, he was nearly a year older than Luther, who was about two months older than Zwingli. The delicate but precocious and promising boy owed it to the influence of his pious and intelligent mother that, instead of being brought up to his father's business, he re-

¹ Life by Hagenbach, in *Väter und Gründer*, u. s. w.

ceived a scholar's education. After early instruction at home, John had the advantage of an excellent school at Heilbronn, and later of the University of Heidelberg. The vigorous mind of Œcolampadius ranged beyond his required studies, and he read widely in the church fathers and other writers. Still thirsting for knowledge and further preparation before becoming a priest and preacher, he went for a time to the University of Tübingen, where, among others, he found a congenial friend in the much younger but already remarkable scholar, Philip Melancthon. Reuchlin was then in Stuttgart, not far away, and Œcolampadius took a course in Hebrew with that famous teacher, and pursued the study further at Tübingen, along with Capito and John Brentz, under a converted Jew.

In accordance with a custom then sometimes permitted there had been founded for Œcolampadius by the liberality of his parents a chapel, or preaching place, in his native village, and before going to Tübingen he seems to have spent a few months there. Now he returns to this his first charge and takes up his work more regularly. He made preaching the first thing, and while his sermons yet retained many of the Catholic habits and methods, they were both more evangelical and more expository than the old sort, and they made a great impression on his people. His first publication was a series of sermons on the seven last sayings of our Lord on the cross.

Between the time of this first work as preacher at Weinsberg and his final settlement at Basel for the work of his life Œcolampadius had a strangely checkered career. Interesting as the details are in themselves and significant in his preparations for becoming the chief reformer at Basel, they cannot here be discussed at any length. We find him for a short time at Basel, then at Augsburg, then, strangely enough, for a few months in a monastery; then a little while chaplain to the reforming knight, Francis of Sickingen. Here he made progress in reforming principles and introduced some changes in worship.

But soon Œcolampadius gave up this place also and accepted an invitation from his friend Kratander, the publisher at Basel, to pay a visit of indefinite duration at his house and wait till a professorship or some place suit-

able for him should open. It was under these circumstances that he took up what was to be his lifelong residence in Basel, Nov. 17th, 1522.

In a few weeks, the pastor of St. Martin's church being in poor health, a place as vicar was offered Œcolampadius there; and he began his fruitful ministry in that church. At first his duties were not very arduous, and he had time for his much loved studies. About this time, without personal acquaintance, he began a correspondence with Zwingli. He also corresponded with other reformers. Besides his expository and increasingly evangelical sermons at St. Martin's, Œcolampadius began to give—presumably at the university, though by what arrangement does not appear—a course of lectures, expounding, first, the prophecy of Isaiah, and then the Epistle to the Romans. These, as well as his more popular sermons on the first Epistle of John, were afterwards published, and gave great satisfaction to the friends of the Reformation in many quarters. Though Œcolampadius was doubtful of the value of public debates, and deprecated their evils, he yet was led to propose a public discussion of four propositions on the questions of the age. The discussion occurred in August, 1523, in the college chapel, was well attended, and produced good results.

Later came William Farel, the hot-headed, but eloquent, French reformer. He was welcomed by Œcolampadius and encouraged to hold a public discussion, which was attended with interest and did good. But Œcolampadius did not really care much for these public debates. His main work was preaching, and in this he was not only eminently successful in drawing the people, but in greatly instructing and profoundly moving them. He began to preach on week days as well as Sundays, and the people came in eager and large congregations. Thus the seeds of evangelical views of truth were richly sown in the hearts of many of the best and most influential people of the city, and the results were soon seen in many ways. The secular authorities of the city, as at Zürich and Bern, began to take action favoring the Reformation. One of their first acts (in 1525) was to give Œcolampadius the position of leading preacher at St. Martin's, for up to this time he had still been only vicar. This in-

creased his dignity and influence, but it also added to his labors and cares.

From now on for four years the reformation in Basel proceeded in rapid order till, early in 1529, the doing away of the mass and the images in the churches marked its final establishment. During these years of strife and progress Œcolampadius was a busy and laborious man, but he stood his ground and did his work nobly.

The few remaining years of his life were abundantly occupied in preaching, writing, confirming the Reformation at home and lending wise counsel and good influence to the cause elsewhere. The catastrophe at Cappel was a shock from which Œcolampadius never recovered. His own end was near. An illness that proved to be fatal attacked his always feeble and much overwrought frame, and in November, 1531, he joined his fellow-worker and friend where strifes are no more. And so they went—those two great brave souls—one from the battlefield, calm and ready amid strife, carnage and defeat; the other from the Christian's dying bed, hopeful, victorious, and in perfect peace.

Œcolampadius was an active and successful preacher, without the highest oratorical genius. He had no impressive external gifts, being small and feeble of frame, and having a weak though not unpleasant voice. But his vigorous intelligence, sincerity and depth of feeling, ample learning, aptness and power in exposition, clearness and ease of expression, more than made up for lack of the externals. So we do not wonder, when we read his sermons, and remember the traits of his character and the facts of his life, that he should have attracted and held large and eager congregations, and should have accomplished the work he was set to do chiefly by the ministry of the Word.

The successor of Œcolampadius at Basel was Zwingli's warm friend, the eminent teacher Oswald Myconius¹ (1488-1552). Born at Lucerne in 1488, the son of a miller named Geisshussler, he later acquired in some way the Greek name of Myconius—probably a nickname given to him by Erasmus. With others, eager like himself for learning, he studied and then became a teacher at Basel,

¹ Hagenbach again in the series last mentioned.

where, also, he married. While at Basel he was on intimate terms with Erasmus, and there, too, he met Zwingli and Leo Jud. In 1516 he came to Zürich to teach in the school connected with the Grossmünster, and while there deepened his friendship with Zwingli, who was then at Einsiedeln. He was largely instrumental in having Zwingli come to Zürich; but did not himself remain long there, having accepted an invitation to return to his native Lucerne and teach. He espoused warmly the reformatory views, which were unpopular at Lucerne, and was called a "Lutheran heretic." At last the people became so enraged against him that he had to leave, and Leo Jud secured a temporary place for him at Einsiedeln, in 1522. As soon as a vacancy occurred in the school at Frauenmünster, in Zürich, his friends there secured it for him. It was truly a comfort to Zwingli to have the two tried friends—Jud and Myconius—with him in Zürich, one as preacher at St. Peter's, the other as teacher at the Frauenmünster. Here Myconius remained till Zwingli's death. He had in his home an admiring pupil, who relates that when Myconius heard the news of Zwingli's death, he said, "I can no longer stay here!" While not an ordained preacher, he had, at the request of the council, combined oral Scripture exposition, which was really preaching, with his work as teacher, and thus gradually took up the ministry of the Word. His pupil and young friend, Plater, having gone to Basel to teach, and knowing of Myconius' desire to leave Zürich, spoke of his old teacher so warmly to friends that he was authorized to go back to Zürich and conduct Myconius to Basel, where he could visit and preach at the church of St. Albans, where there was a vacancy in the pulpit. His trial sermon was so pronounced a success that he was called to the post in December, 1531. When he began his work at St. Albans, Basel was mourning the recent death of *Æcolampadius*, and the council was much exercised to find a suitable follower to that remarkable and beloved man and leader. But Myconius' success at St. Albans was so immediate and decided that after a few months the council decided to promote him to the cathedral as the successor to the recently deceased leader.

No one was more surprised at this turn of affairs than

the modest Myconius himself. He thus wrote of it to a friend: "I am named as successor to the sainted *Œcolampadius*. Great God, what disparity! But God has so ordained. . . . Unexpected and strange is it all to me. Earnestly do I pray God that sooner he would remove me from the earth than that his glory should be lessened by my induction into office." In such a spirit the mild-mannered teacher entered on his new and responsible position, but on the express understanding that he should hold the place only till a more suitable person could be found. None was found. He held the place twenty years, till his death in 1552.

Myconius was a fine teacher and an able expounder of the Word of God. His preaching was simple, clear and eminently Scriptural in matter and tone. He was not fond of display nor endowed with oratorical gifts, but he was heard with great acceptance and profit, for he preached with force and unction. One thing he says of his preaching will doubtless be well understood by many another faithful preacher: "I have been preaching the gospel ten years, and yet I cannot say that in attacking sin I am satisfied with myself. Sometimes I go beyond bounds, sometimes I do too little. I dare not be silent, and yet I cannot strike the right measure, which often not a little disturbs me." Faithful soul! perplexed to find the just combination of the pastor's and the prophet's functions! Yet this modest, amiable, faithful man preached in what was virtually his only charge for twenty years, carried on the work of a greater man than himself, and exerted a wide and lasting influence for the cause he so much loved.

The city of Bern, now the capital of the Swiss Federation, lies in a beautiful situation in the heart of picturesque Switzerland. Founded by the Duke of Zähringen in the end of the twelfth century, it was not so old as some other Swiss cities, but was from the first characterized by the bravery and independence of its people. It joined the Swiss Federation in 1353, having previously won its independence, and at once assumed and ever held a leading place in the affairs of the republic. Like other cities Bern had, through its council, considerable influence and control in ecclesiastical affairs. But here, as

elsewhere, the sad demoralization of the people through the practice of mercenary warfare, and of the clergy through the evils so common everywhere, made the religious outlook discouraging in the extreme. There was not so much culture as in other places, and the superstition of many of the people made them easy victims of the indulgence-seller Samson, who rivalled Tetzels in Saxony. Yet there were not wanting among the people and in the council men who were heartily ashamed of the evil state of affairs, and were willing to be led in a better way when the time and the leader appointed of God should arrive. The time was the great reform movement in the sixteenth century, the leader Berthold Haller.¹

In the memorable year of 1492 the future Bernese reformer was born in the Swabian village of Aldingen. The lad was of delicate constitution, but of quick intelligence and amiable character. He had an excellent teacher at Rottweil, and later studied at Pforzheim under Gerard Simler, afterwards professor at Tübingen. Among his schoolmates was Simon Grynæus, later the noted humanistic teacher at Basel, and the young Philip Melancthon. Haller then spent two years at Cologne studying the dry bones of the degenerate scholastic theology, which no more satisfied him than it had Æcolampadius before him. He longed for further and more extensive studies, but accepted a place for a while as teacher at Rottweil, and was just about to go to Freiburg for further education when, in 1513, a call came to go to Bern as assistant teacher in a flourishing school. He knew not what was before him when he accepted this place and took up his residence as teacher, with apparently some preaching duties attached to his office, in the city that he was so profoundly to influence for all time.

Haller quickly made friends by his kindly sociable nature, having attracted notice by his eloquence and force of speech. He was elected chaplain of one of the guilds of citizens, and from 1517 held some official position in the church. His duties were varied and exacting from the start, and he never had the leisure for those studies that he so longed to pursue. He never became so great a scholar as many of the other reformers, and regretted

¹ Life by Pestalozzi in *Väter und Gründer*, u. s. w.

often the course of affairs that hindered his development in that direction. He was early attracted by the evangelical views, and his devotion to these was largely stimulated and confirmed by the presence at this time in Bern as canon and preacher at the Münster of that very Thomas Wyttenbach who at Basel had so profoundly influenced Zwingli and Leo Jud. Haller served as deacon under Wyttenbach, and lived with him till his retirement from Bern in 1520. Already in the preceding year a decisive turn had come in Haller's life by his appointment as canon and one of the chief preachers at the Münster. His place had come to him, and he was ready for his work.

Haller began at the great cathedral—a very imposing building still—in a very simple way. He took the appointed lessons as the basis of his sermons and expounded these carefully and with decided evangelical views. Later he added a series of discourses on the Ten Commandments, using Luther's exposition as a guide. His preaching was popular, and his congregations grew large and remained so. In 1521 he visited Zwingli at Zürich and received hearty commendation and help in his work. The friendship was warm and lasting, and there was frequent correspondence between the two till Zwingli's death. About this time the eloquent French Franciscan, Lambert, came to Bern on his way to Germany on a preaching tour. Though yet a monk Lambert was full of reformation ideas. Not knowing German, he preached in Latin to the priests and others, and his attacks on existing evils made a great stir. Some of the clergy were furious and tried to have the council restrain the fiery Frenchman. But that body, on the contrary, upheld him, and took occasion to declare in favor of a larger liberty to the preachers.

Soon Haller began a series of expository sermons on Matthew, influenced no doubt by Zwingli's experiment at Zürich, and his preaching was even more sought after by the people who were thirsting for the gospel truth, and his earnest teaching was having great influence. In 1523 the Bern council passed an ordinance similar to that of Zürich, instructing the preachers to preach the "pure Word of God freely, openly and without restraint." With

this good beginning the government became more and more pronounced in favor of the new order of things; and progress, not without friction, setbacks, and various trials, was continually made. The Anabaptist controversy also made its appearance at Bern, and caused much trial to Haller and the rest. In 1527 the Bernese council called for a great conference and debate on all the questions between the Catholic and Reforming parties. It began in January, 1528, and lasted for nineteen days. Zwingli was present, also Œcolampadius, Bullinger, Butzer, Farel, and other leading reformers, besides a fair representation of Catholics. It was a triumph for Reformed opinions and greatly strengthened the cause throughout all Switzerland and beyond. Before the disputants had left the council took action and did away with the mass and the images in the churches. This marked the victory.

It now remained for Haller and his associates to settle and organize the new ecclesiastical constitution and confirm what had been done. The death of Zwingli and the peril that followed the defeat at Cappel were serious wounds to the cause; but the work went on. Haller's long and hard labors had worn him down; he fell an easy prey to disease, and passed to his reward in 1536, only forty-four years old. As a scholar he does not rank as high as the other leaders in the Reformation, but in fidelity and wisdom, in moderation combined with courage and patience, he falls behind none. His preaching bore the character marks of the reform movement in contents and method; in style it was simple and unambitious, but clear, forcible and winning. Its best praise is that it pleased, instructed and moulded the people to whom it was directed.

6. THE STRASBURG REFORMERS

This seems the best place to consider the preachers of the Reformation at Strasburg, for though it was a German and not a Swiss city, the leaders there occupied a mediating position between the Lutheran and Zwinglian views, and, on the whole, inclined more to the latter.

Strasburg was one of the ancient free cities of the German empire. It had acquired self-government in

1333, and in 1482 had adopted a new and very liberal popular constitution. Under this the city government had secured a very large control in ecclesiastical as well as civil affairs, and had so limited the authority of the bishop and reduced his importance that he preferred to live elsewhere and be represented at Strasburg by a vicar. The state of the clergy was bad, as usual. But among the best citizens were not a few who detested the existing state of things and were ready for a change. Perhaps the influence of that old mediæval mysticism and the work of Tauler were not wholly gone, and certainly the long and powerful ministry (1478-1510) of John Geiler of Kaisersberg was fresh in the minds of many when the Reformation began. We must also reckon among preparatory tendencies the entrance of Humanism under the auspices of Erasmus, Wimpheling and others. So when Luther began his attack on the papal abuses in 1517 there were many in Strasburg who hailed his bold strokes as the beginning of a real and long-hoped-for reform. Among these was a preacher and priest named Matthew Zell, who was already doing some effective reformatory preaching when, in 1523, the two men came who were to be the leaders in establishing the Reformation in Strasburg; these were Wolfgang Capito and Martin Bucer, or Butzer.¹

At the then somewhat considerable town of Haguenau, in Alsace, there lived toward the end of the fifteenth century a German family named Köpfel, signifying "little head." Among the sons of the family, born in 1478, was one who received the name of Wolfgang and afterward Latinized his surname into Capito. In after years he remembered to have heard as a lad considerable talk of Huss and Jerome of Prague; of good John of Wesel, who had been imprisoned and died in jail because at Augsburg he had dared to preach that the Bible was above the pope; and of the great "Dr. Kaisersberg," as Geiler was familiarly called, who was preaching with such power at Strasburg. The eager and intelligent boy was educated with a view to medicine as a profes-

¹ An admirable double biography is that of W. Baum in the *Väter und Gründer* series; and a well written article based on this work is found in the (English) *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, on account of Butzer's work in England.

sion, and after preliminary schooling got his degree in medicine at the University of Freiburg. But his heart was not in that branch of study; and his father's death soon after he received his degree made him feel the impotence of his profession, and also left him free to leave it. As he had means to pursue his studies where and as he liked, he turned to law, and then theology, studying at Freiburg, Basel, and Ingolstadt, as suited his pleasure. Thus he was graduated in the three departments of medicine, law, and theology, taking his degree in the last from Ingolstadt. Besides the regular course he read widely, and became one of the most accomplished scholars of his age, being a peer in that brilliant coterie of Humanists that centered in Basel around Erasmus. He was made, in the fall of 1511, dean of the faculty of liberal arts at Freiburg and licentiate—that is, lecturer—in theology. But he desired to preach, and was glad to accept a call to Bruchsal, an inconsiderable pastorate in the diocese of Spire, where he spent several years.

Capito's next appointment was much more to his taste—in 1515 he was made one of the cathedral preachers at Basel. Here for some years he labored with much success, preaching with great acceptance and growing all the time in evangelical convictions. He was one of those men whom insight, breadth and charity prevent from being partisans; who can always see both sides of a quarrel and have sympathy for whatever is good in both. This amiable characteristic often gives rise to suspicions of insincerity, wavering, and doubleness. But Capito was not open to such charges. He agreed with Luther, but disliked his coarseness; he did not hold with Erasmus, but he admired his good points and valued his friendship. Hence he tried in vain to hinder or heal the breach between these men, and to some extent suffered in the estimation of both. He did not believe in rash revolutionary measures, but favored the progress of reformation principles by the slower method of indoctrination and influence. The strifes at Basel became too fierce for his peaceful nature, and he was glad to accept a position—not a very well defined one—as preacher and secretary to that curious jumble of politician and ecclesiastic, petty prince and electoral archbishop, Albert of Brandenburg, at

Mainz. As counsellor of that dignitary he attended the famous Diet at Worms, in 1521, where Luther made his brave stand. More and more Capito was satisfied of the truth of the Reformation doctrines, and his position at Mainz was becoming intolerable. It was a welcome call, therefore, that came to him from the authorities at Strasburg in 1523 to become chief preacher at the church of St. Thomas in that city.

This was a decisive point and the opening of the last stage in Capito's life. On coming to Strasburg he found Matthew Zell at work, and later in the same year (1523) came Martin Butzer. The three worked together in great harmony, according to their different characters; and by their preaching, the intelligent aid of the council, and the providential drift of the age, the Reformation was finally established at Strasburg in 1529. On February 20 of that year the popular assembly by a vote of 184 to 94 ordered the discontinuance of the mass in the churches. Of course there were trials in all this time. Capito had been promoted to the pastorate at St. Peter's Church, and his congregations and influence had increased. He felt the justice of many of the demands of the peasants, but counselled moderation; he saw much that was Scriptural in the Anabaptist contentions, and though deploring their excesses, he judged them much less harshly than did his colleagues; he sympathized with Zwingli's views on the Lord's Supper, but would take no part in the Marburg conference. He had much to do in drawing up the so-called Tetrapolitan Confession—representing the theologians of the four cities of Strasburg, Lindau, Constance and Memmingen—which emphasized the mediating position of the Strasburg leaders. In 1541 the plague visited the city, and among its numerous victims was the venerable and beloved Capito.

Enough has been said of his great learning, his notable moderation and breadth of sympathy. As a preacher he was not preëminent, but Scriptural, clear, winsome. His scholarly expositions, earnestness of feeling, and acceptability of manner, drew always good congregations, who loved to wait on his ministry; and, as in the case of others who stand in the second rank as preachers, the best witness to the power of his preaching is not the tra-

dition of remarkable eloquence, but the enduring good accomplished.

One of the most interesting characters in the history of the Reformation was Capito's colleague at Strasburg, Martin Butzer, or Bucer, as the name is more commonly but less correctly written. His father, a well esteemed man, was a cooper by trade, and lived first at Schlestadt, where Martin was born, in 1491, and later removed to Strasburg, where he became in time a respected member of the council. The story of Martin Butzer's life and work is full of vicissitudes and interest, but as he was more of a theologian and lecturer than preacher, he can claim only summary notice here. For the sake of education he joined the Dominicans, and for a while, in their monastery at Heidelberg, enjoyed university privileges. Released from his vows at last because of growing reformatory principles, he held an assistant's place in a church at Weissenberg. Like a true reformer, he had defied the law of celibacy and married an excellent wife. His reform preaching aroused opposition, and both he and his superior were driven out of Weissenberg.

It was thus that Martin Butzer, in the early spring of 1523, came to his father's house in Strasburg, homeless, without means, with a young wife, soon to be a mother, and accompanied by a friend similarly situated.

Capito and Zell welcomed Butzer as an able recruit in their reforming campaign, but though many in Strasburg sympathized with the new views, and the authorities were leaning that way, it still was not so easy to find a place for a married priest. People had not yet become accustomed to that part of the reform! Still the son of good citizen Butzer was not to be discredited, and the friend of Capito could not be ignored. Soon some place was found for him to teach, expound the Scriptures, and thus really preach; and later, upon the foundation of the university, he was appointed a professor, and with the progress of the reformation there came to him full recognition as preacher and places to preach with authority.

The main significance of Martin Butzer in the history of the Reformation lies in the laborious, earnest, faithful, but ineffectual, efforts he made to harmonize the Lutheran and Zwinglian parties in their unhappy division

over the Lord's Supper. It was the problem and the effort of his life, and it brought him much trial and little success. His realization of the beatitude of the peacemakers was reserved for the heavenly life.

When the result of the Smalcald War left Charles V. free to oppress the Protestants, Butzer opposed with all earnestness the emperor's so-called Interim, or effort to enforce a religious truce by compromise. But Strasburg was made to accept the Interim, and Butzer in 1548 left the city and country. At that time, under Edward VI. and Cranmer, Protestantism was in the ascendant in England, and by Cranmer's influence Butzer was offered a professorship of theology at Cambridge. He was glad to accept the place, and so ended his interesting and useful life as professor in one of England's great universities. He was diligent in lecturing and writing while at Cambridge, but his failing health hindered and shortened his activity, and in 1551 he died. It is shameful that under Bloody Mary his body was disinterred and burned; but in the reign of Elizabeth honor was done to his memory.

Butzer had ample scholarship, and held his own with the lights of his time in theological learning. He left numerous writings on many subjects, mostly in Latin. His style was diffuse and obscure, so much so that Calvin once said in speaking of some writing of a like mind, "Butzer himself has nothing so obscure, ambiguous, tortuous." Of his sermons, strictly speaking, there seem to be no important remains. If his spoken discourse was like his writing he must have been hard to follow; but he had a good voice and presence, and his long and successful service in the pulpit shows that, notwithstanding faults of style, and some lack of clearness in thought, he must have been more than an ordinary preacher.

We must not forget that besides these great leaders who have been singled out for notice, there were a great many others, more or less known, who caught the spirit and methods of these and exemplified the peculiar type of Reformation preaching all over German Switzerland. Some would be well worthy of study, both for their characters and methods; but those whom we have had under

review are enough to indicate both the general course of the Swiss Reformation and the kind of preaching which characterized it. Nor must we forget the Anabaptists, for whom the gentle Capito had a kindly feeling, the other leaders only opposition and persecution; but it seems best to tell what little is known of them and their preaching in connection with their brethren in other countries.

CHAPTER XIII

PREACHERS OF THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE AND OTHER EUROPEAN LANDS

It was an unhappy thing for France that the character of her monarch and the condition of her affairs in the early sixteenth century forced into exile or obscurity or subserviency the men who would have been her reformers. To those who were too great to be obscure and too true to be subservient exile was the only resource, and hence the center of French reform is not Paris or Lyons, but Geneva. Yet the beginnings were in France.

I. THE PARTIAL AND EARLY REFORMERS

As in other lands, the movement started in France among the churchmen with no thought of separation, but of purification in both doctrine and morals. And though many of those who started the movement remained still in the old church, they are worthy of remembrance for what they began and left to more consistent men to carry on. Several of these deserve notice.

Jacques Le Fèvre d'Étaples, or Jacobus Faber Stapulensis, in the Latin form of his name, was not a preacher, but an eminent humanist scholar, and the beloved and influential teacher of many preachers. He was a man remarkable for sweetness of character, and for all sorts of learning. When he gave his attention to Biblical and theological subjects he touched them with the hand of a master. His views were decidedly in the direction of reform, but, like Erasmus—though very unlike him in many respects—he stopped short when it came to leaving the Catholic church. William Briçonnet, bishop of Meaux, and by special permission also abbot of St.

Germain des Prés at Paris, was a pupil of Le Fèvre, and at one time had decided leanings toward reform, though he, too, naturally drew back when separation from the Catholic church became a logical necessity. When Briçonnet became abbot of St. Germain des Prés in 1507 he gave Le Fèvre an appointment as teacher in his abbey, and here for a number of years the pious scholar taught the Scriptures. He published versions of the Bible and a number of long useful commentaries, and he had among his pupils at different times both Farel and Calvin, besides a number of others who in one way or another took part in the religious movements of the age. Le Fèvre's commentaries show that he taught a much purer Christianity than the current Romanism, and it is no wonder that numbers of his pupils became Reformers. Briçonnet, too, after his manner, gave decided impulse to the new movement, for among other things he encouraged in his diocese of Meaux a number of men to preach and expound the Scriptures in the new way. But this work was broken up when the church authorities perceived its drift, and Briçonnet returned to a closer conformity to the old religion.

One who came much nearer at one time to being an active reformer than either Le Fèvre or Briçonnet was Gerard Roussel (1480-1550), who came from near Amiens, and was a pupil of Le Fèvre. He gave sympathy and applause to Luther's first steps in beginning the Reformation. He was one of those who at Briçonnet's invitation preached the evangelical doctrines in his diocese, but was required to cease when the authorities withdrew the permission. In 1525 he fled to Strasburg to escape arrest, but was recalled at the instance of Queen Margaret of Navarre, the sister of Francis I., who favored the reformers and helped them all she could. Later Roussel became her confessor, and later still, through her influence, was made a bishop. His reaction toward the old faith and virtual abandonment of the reformed cause afterwards called forth a strong letter from Calvin rebuking him for his course. He was an eloquent and forcible preacher, and though he did not leave the Catholic church he was really one of the pioneer preachers of reform in France.

Coming to those who in the early years followed conscience and logic, and thus came out of the old establishment into new and untried ways, we meet almost first the honored name of François Lambert (d. 1530). He was born at Avignon in 1486. At fifteen years of age he joined the Franciscan order, and soon so distinguished himself by his study of the Scriptures and by his eloquence that he was made a travelling preacher. Like Luther he had great spiritual struggles, and even wished to go into a more strict order of monks for discipline, but this was refused him. About 1520 he read the early writings of Luther and became at once and decidedly convinced that the reformer was right. He was not a man to keep silent, and naturally fell under suspicion of heresy. Notwithstanding this, however, it may be at his own request, he was sent on a preaching tour into Germany in 1522. Going by way of Geneva and Lausanne, he came to Bern, where he met Haller, and was encouraged by him to hold a public disputation on the points involved in the current controversy. Thus he and Haller gave each other help and encouragement, and Lambert went on his way strengthened in his views. At Zürich his remaining doubts were resolved and he decisively committed himself to the Reformation, though this meant severance from his order and exile from his native land. Perhaps he did not regret the first of these results, but the second was always a grief to him. His life henceforth belongs to Germany rather than to France.

He went to Wittenberg in 1523, and there forever renounced Catholicism, married and took a course in theology with Luther, Melanchthon and the rest. It was impossible for him now to return to France, though he tried to get a place at Metz, and then at Strasburg, where he might be near enough to help the cause of his native land. But he failed to become established at either place. At last he came under the notice of Philip of Hesse, who protected him and got him to draw up a plan of organization for the Protestant churches in Hesse. Though his plan had to be modified in many particulars it was the basis of the Hessian church system. In 1527 he was made a professor in the newly constituted university at Marburg, but did not live long to fill this place, being car-

ried off by the plague in 1530. His reformatory views were rather Zwinglian than Lutheran. He was an eloquent and impressive speaker, after the Keltic type, and was often too vehement in action and in word. But he was a true and noble man, and would gladly have given his life to France if he had been permitted.

2. FAREL AND HIS ASSOCIATES

The leading place among the early French and Swiss Reformers belongs to Farel and the two younger men associated with him, Froment and Viret.¹

The leader of this group, William Farel (d. 1565), was born at Gap in 1489. He was one of a large family, early showed a fondness for study and religion, and, after making good progress in the neighborhood schools, he was sent to the University of Paris for further study. But the quality of instruction had so declined in those days that the ardent mind of Farel was not satisfied by it, and he turned to Le Fèvre for teaching in philosophy. Le Fèvre, it will be remembered, was also teaching the Bible and theology. The study of the Scriptures under that great teacher was an increasing delight to the young man, and it led him to see clearly that there was a woful difference between the Bible and the doctrines and practices of the Catholic church. There was the inevitable struggle between the traditional beliefs and his new-found faith. When he laid his case before Le Fèvre the good teacher said, "My friend, listen well to this: I read the signs of the times and here is my thought—God is going to renew the face of the religious world, and you will be a witness of it." Then and there the young man felt that he must not only witness but take part in the coming change. He gladly availed himself of Briçonnet's plan of campaign, and after remaining awhile longer at Paris, he was found at Meaux in 1521 with that group of ardent young souls preaching and expounding the Scriptures among the people. A stop was soon put to the good bishop's innovation, and the movement was

¹ Besides various encyclopædia articles, accounts in the church histories, and incidental notices in Beza's and Bungere's lives of Calvin, I have found profit and pleasure in reading a bright sketch by Charles Chenévière, *Farel, Froment et Viret*, Geneva, 1855.

suppressed. As Farel had been very zealous and pronounced, he thought it best to go into hiding for awhile, hoping that the storm would cease and he would in time have some opening in France to preach the reform doctrines. But after about a year of inactivity, as the prospects seemed no better, he sadly turned away from France and came, in 1523, to Basel.

Here the excellent Œcolampadius received and encouraged him. It will be recalled that they held a public disputation on the questions between the Catholics and Reformers. Farel put up his theses in Latin and defended them in the same tongue, Œcolampadius interpreting. The result was favorable to reform and encouraging to the Reformers. But it aroused the ire of Erasmus, and he used his influence to have Farel sent away.

After visiting Zürich, and later Strasburg, Farel turned, though not without fear and trembling at first, to French Switzerland. It is pleasant to know that his chief human encouragement in beginning the distinctive work of his life came from the wise and gentle Œcolampadius, who not only urged him to the task, but gave him salutary and needed cautions against the vehemence and excess which were Farel's main fault. He had a successful evangelistic career in the towns of French Switzerland. In some he remained longer than in others, in all he preached the gospel with an eloquence born of conviction, and with all the fire of his race. He did not always keep the good counsel of Œcolampadius—he was a Frenchman—and Farel! Once he snatched the wafer out of the hand of a priest who was going to administer extreme unction to a dying man. This was perhaps the most extreme of his many extravagant actions, and was indefensible on any grounds. It is needless to say that his usefulness in that place was at an end.

Often he was mobbed, insulted, sometimes beaten, but never subdued. When he succeeded in establishing a reformed church in a place he would leave it in the hands of a pastor or pastors. At Orbe, in 1531, he was very roughly treated, but his visit there is memorable for having brought out and started on his way the later associate of himself and Calvin at Geneva, the useful and eloquent Viret.

In 1532 Farel attended the synod at Bern, and then went, at great risk, into Piedmont to a synod of the Waldenses and helped them conform their churches more closely to the divine Word. He saw that they needed leaders and a version of the Bible, and he promised to send them four men who should help them. He was as good as his word, and later sent them the men, among whom was Robert Olivetan, a kinsman and friend of John Calvin, who had helped that young man in his early struggles toward the truth, an admirable teacher who had aided in giving the Reformation a start at Geneva, and a pious scholar whose version of the Scriptures for these Waldensians was one of the earliest translations of the Bible into French.

On his return from Piedmont, accompanied by Saunier, another useful helper and preacher, Farel came to Geneva in September, 1532. Olivetan was then teaching there, and he told Farel that a beginning had been made toward reform, and that some people in Geneva were hungering for the truth. Farel needed no further hint, and decided to remain and preach the reform. He held frequent conversations with those who would come to his lodgings, and as a result fifteen citizens were converted. The news spread, and soon the lodgings would not hold the crowds who came to hear the gospel. This, of course, roused the anger of the Catholics, and there was much excitement. But the city authorities proposed that Farel should meet his opponents in a public discussion of the points in controversy, and that the debate should be held before the council. Nothing suited Farel better, and he and his friends came joyfully before the council on the day appointed. But the priests wanted no fair debate; there was no prospect of victory for them in that. Instead of arguments they resorted to clubs, and made a tumult, breaking up the meeting with violence. Farel and Saunier were beaten almost to death, but finally the authorities succeeded in getting them out of the city. Thus in disorder and violence Protestantism made its beginning in Geneva, but it had come to stay; and this seeming defeat was not the last of Farel. At Granson the two companions, wounded and sore, but not discouraged, recounted their experiences to sympathizers,

and among these was Antoine Froment, who was filled with a desire to go to Geneva and find ways to hold together the disciples who had been gathered there, and carry on the work. He went, in this fall of 1532. In the next year, encouraged and in a measure protected by the Bernese authorities, who had strong and growing political influence at Geneva, Farel returned, accompanied this time by Viret. They joined Froment in carrying forward the work. The details of their trials and successes we have to pass over. Suffice it to say that the Reformation constantly gained upon the old faith, both among the people and with their official heads, but there was constant and formidable opposition.

In 1535 the long contest was decided, and by formal vote of the council Protestantism was recognized and established as the religion of Geneva. But much remained to be done both in settling the new order of things and in keeping up the fight with the remaining and vigorous opposition.

In the early summer of 1536 the young John Calvin was passing through Geneva with his brother and sister, seeking in this roundabout way a refuge in Strasburg or Basel. Farel saw in Calvin the qualifications needed just then in a leader for Geneva, and so wrought upon him that Calvin heeded the call as from God and consented to remain and work with the three pioneers in further establishing and strengthening the cause of reform in Geneva.

For a time the four reformers worked on together, but soon Viret went to Lausanne, and in 1538 the party hostile to the disciplinary measures of the reform gained the upper hand, and banished Calvin, Farel and Froment. After awhile Farel became pastor at Neuchatel, which remained his place of residence and the main scene of his labors until his death, in 1565, a few months after Calvin's. The remainder of his long and useful life was full of activity and of successful work. Neuchatel formally adopted the Reformation in 1542, and other signal successes were achieved by the veteran. But his life had reached its culmination in that dramatic and splendid scene when he laid on the heart and mind of John Calvin the cause of reform at Geneva, and resigned into abler

hands than his own the direction and consummation of a work that his courage, eloquence and self-sacrifice had so nobly begun.

Farel was not without serious faults of character, chief of which were his rashness and excess. He could not be prudent, and was sometimes vehement to the point of violence and rudeness. But he was sincere, self-sacrificing, devoted and brave. He left some writings, but they are of no great importance. He had studied well in his youth, and was well versed in the Scriptures, but he was a man of action rather than of the pen. He was not a deep but a quick and ready thinker, and a good debater. No sermons remain as specimens of his preaching, and if they did they could not in printed form express the man. But the results of his work and the accounts of his preaching tell us more plainly than written discourses could that he was a man of mighty and moving speech. He had good presence and voice, his words came like a torrent, and his own fiery nature and powerful convictions kindled a glow in those who heard. Sharp and bitter in attack, he could also be tender and persuasive in appeal. Before the multitude, in the popular eloquence that takes hold of the crowd and stirs them profoundly, whether for opposition or consent, there was among the early reformers no superior to William Farel.

Antoine Froment (1509-1581) was born in Dauphiné, and was early converted there under the influence of one of the evangelical preachers of Briçonnet's company at Meaux. He began to preach, but persecution soon drove him to find a refuge in Switzerland, where he met with Farel and took some share in his work. On the expulsion of Farel and Saunier from Geneva in 1532, Froment was working at Granson, and the story of their success and sufferings so worked on him that, with Farel's encouragement, he determined to go to Geneva, and, if possible, find some means to continue the work which they had begun and had been so rudely forced to leave. Arriving in Geneva he opened a school for teaching French, and along with that taught the new doctrines in religion. The pupils told their parents, many of them were interested, others gathered, and Froment's school soon became a place of worship. The opposition was

alert and active, and Froment thought he would have to leave. In fact, he did start away, but had not gone far before he began to feel that he was not playing the man, and he determined to retrace his steps and, braving all danger, take up his work again. Later he was joined by Farel and Viret, as we have seen, and the three worked on together till Calvin came, in 1536, and gave a new impetus and direction to the work, till all were forced to retire for awhile in 1538.

The later life of Froment was, unhappily, not creditable. He fell into serious faults. In 1549 he left the ministry, and in various ways made his living. Among other things he was at one time secretary to Bonivard, the famous Genevese patriot and "prisoner of Chillon," at whose request Froment wrote an account of the early days of the Reformation in Geneva. It is believed that Froment sincerely repented of his errors of conduct. The lapse of his later years has been forgotten in appreciation of his earlier services, and his name is inscribed, along with those of Farel, Viret, and Calvin, on the memorial tablet in the temple of St. Pierre at Geneva as one of the honored reformers of the city.

As a preacher Froment had something of the popular eloquence, the rough and ready speech of Farel, but he was not so great a man either in mind or character.

A worthier and abler man than Froment was Pierre Viret (1511-1571), a native of Orbe, in the canton of Vaud, and, therefore, a Swiss by birth. His father was a tailor, who, however, perceived and appreciated the talent and promise of his son, designed him for the church, and in 1527 sent him to Paris to be educated for the priesthood. Here for three years he studied under Le Fèvre, whose teaching planted deeply in his mind the seeds of evangelical truth. But, properly speaking, his conversion to Protestantism and his entrance into the ministry were, under God, the work of Farel. In 1531 that intense reformer was preaching at Orbe, and, as usual, met with opposition and ill-treatment. Viret was roused to sympathy by the indignities put upon the preacher, as well as strengthened in his reformed convictions by the preaching. Farel invited him to share his work and his sufferings, and to begin by preaching

then and there, in his own town, the doctrines that he held. Viret consented, and preached his first sermon as a reformer under those circumstances. He was with Farel a good deal in his travels, but also did much independent work. He preached at many places in Switzerland and in southern France, and had his share of interesting and perilous adventures. Once his life was attempted by an angry priest, who wounded him with a sword, and once a fanatical servant girl poisoned his food and he with difficulty recovered. These injuries seriously impaired his health for life. His work at Neuchatel and Lausanne was greatly blessed, and, as we have seen, he worked with Farel and Froment in getting the Reformation established in Geneva in 1535. Two years later, and before the retirement of the reformers from Geneva, Viret accepted a call to Lausanne, where he did excellent and lasting service to the cause of reform, not only as pastor, but also by the establishment of a school, the germ of that noble university which has had so honorable a record in Protestant history.

When Geneva, tired of anarchy in religion and unbri-dled license in manners, concluded to recall the reformers, Viret was invited to come back from Lausanne, and he returned to Geneva before Calvin. It was greatly to Calvin's delight that he had on his return the help of this true and tried fellow-laborer. But the climate of Geneva proved rather severe for Viret's health, and he sought the south of France. He preached with great success in a number of cities in southern France, and at last, as Chenévière says, "felt himself strong enough to confront the fogs of the Rhone, and respond to a call of the Reformed at Lyons." Here he labored for nearly a year with such wonderful favor that several thousand persons were converted, a strong church was formed, and there was prospect of making Lyons a sort of center for Protestantism in France. But the Catholics were alarmed and procured an edict from Charles IX. that only native-born Frenchmen be allowed to preach in the Protestant churches in France. As Viret was of Swiss birth, he was forced to leave. Geneva tried again to get him, but he preferred a milder climate, and after teaching school for a while at Orange he made his way to Orthez in the little

and he felt compelled to leave the church he voluntarily resigned both offices.

And now Gerard's ambition takes a new turn, and he decides that under the general permission to pursue his studies at his pleasure John may undertake the study of law, and devote himself to that lucrative profession if he should hereafter find it desirable! Under this liberal construction of privilege we find the obedient son—not from his own inclination—next engaged in the mastery of the science of law. He pursued this study with notable success under distinguished teachers at Orleans and Bruges. This training was an important element in his after career.

While at Paris Calvin had been much under the influence of his excellent kinsman, Robert Olivetan, whom he had heard boldly preach the evangelical doctrines. His own earnest study of theology, of the stirring questions raised by the reformers, and, most of all, of the Bible, had been slowly but surely turning his mind toward Protestantism. While studying law at Bruges he forsook neither his Bible studies nor his religious activities. He took up the study of Greek with Alleman (or Walmer, the eminent Swabian humanist, who later also taught Theodore Beza), and in a short time mastered the language and studied the Greek Testament with delight and to good purpose. Meantime the people in the neighborhood, hungering for religious instruction, urged him to lecture and preach. By permission of the authorities he thus informally and often preached and expounded Scripture at the little town of Berri near by. In this way he began his work as a preacher, and thus early was fixed the character of his preaching, as clear and popular exposition of Scripture.

It was during this time, too, that his final hesitations were dismissed, and he found mental and spiritual rest in the full acceptance of the distinctive reformed doctrines and of Christ as the only Saviour. His own account of the great crisis that he then passed is given with characteristic force and terseness in his beautiful Latin in the preface to his commentary on the Psalms, and sets forth the fact that, after he had long been obstinately devoted to the errors of the papacy, God, by his grace, had

“reduced his hardened mind to docility by a sudden conversion.”¹ He does not go into details, as the more genial Luther did, and we can only conjecture the spiritual struggle which culminated thus. Now, too, the death of Gerard Cauvin left the son free to abandon the law and required his attention to the family affairs at Noyon. Later Calvin is sojourning at Paris and publishing his first book, a commentary on Seneca’s *De Clementia*. At twenty-four years of age he is already accomplished in classical, legal and theological training, and walks with firm tread among the scholars of his time. During this sojourn in Paris, not yet having left the Catholic church, possibly hoping still for reformation within it, and waiting for the drift of things, he is not idle, but studying and in various ways teaching the reformed views.

At this time Nicholas Cop was rector of the University of Paris, and being required to deliver a sermon upon some important academic occasion, he asked Calvin to assist him in preparing the discourse. When it was delivered its pronounced Protestantism created a storm. Cop was compelled to flee, and the real author being suspected and hunted, Calvin also was forced to leave Paris. He retired first to Saintonge, where, in various ways, teaching and preaching, he aided the little Protestant flock gathered there; and later went to Nérac to see the aged Le Fèvre, who was living there under protection of Margaret of Navarre. This princess, who in so many ways showed her care for the persecuted Protestants, finally persuaded the king, her brother, to let the Cop affair drop, and Calvin was allowed to return to Paris.

In the year 1534 Calvin went to Noyon and formally resigned the two church offices that he held. He had come to see that reformation within the church was not to be hoped for, and that he must in conscience take his place with the Protestants on the outside. In the fall of that year Francis I., under clerical influences, came out strongly in favor of the old faith, and began a vigorous persecution of the Protestants. This practically

¹ “Deus tamen arcano providentiae suae freno cursum meum alio tandem reflexit. Ac primo quidem, quum superstitionibus papatus magis pertinaciter addictus essem, quam ut facile esset e tam profundo luto me extrahi, animum meum, qui pro aetate nimis obduerat, subita conversione ad docilitatem subegit.”

drove the Protestants out of the kingdom. Like others, Calvin sadly left his native land and retired to Switzerland. At Strasburg he was joyfully welcomed by Capito and Butzer, and later went to Basel, where Myconius and others likewise gave him a cordial reception. During this time, with the help of Capito and Simon Grynæus, he learned Hebrew, and was now ready to study all the Bible in the original languages. But the crowning event of his sojourn at Basel was the writing and publishing, in Latin, of his famous *Institutes of Christianity*. This immortal and epoch-making work was one of the principal labors of Calvin's life, and passed through many editions and revisions before it reached its final form in 1559, a few years before the author's death.

The occasion for writing and publishing the work was that, for political reasons, in his quarrel with Charles V., Francis had caused it to be given out that his oppression of the Protestants in France was directed against seditious sectaries like the Anabaptists and others. Calvin determined that a brief and clear statement of what the Reformed commonly believed was called for. The preface, written in French, was a brave and manly appeal to the French king to consider what his Protestant subjects really believed, and not allow himself to be misled by the calumnies of their enemies. The treatise in six chapters was a compendious and lucid statement of the principal points held by the generality of Protestants as against Rome. It was hailed by Reformers everywhere as a clear and powerful expression of the things they held in common; though (if a remark in the preface to the Psalms is correctly understood) it appeared anonymously, the author soon became known, and his name was on every Protestant tongue. From now on John Calvin takes his place with Zwingli and Luther as one of the three greatest reformers of the sixteenth century.

After the publication of his book Calvin made a visit to Italy to consult the Duchess of Ferrara, a princess of France who, under the influence of Margaret of Valois, had embraced Reformed views and favored the Protestants as much as she dared. But her plans were thwarted by the vigilant and determined Catholics, and, both on her own account and that of her guests, it became unsafe

for them to remain long at Ferrara. By some force of necessity, or during some lull in the watchfulness of the persecutors, Calvin paid a last visit to his old home at Noyon in the summer of 1536. Here he finally settled his affairs, and, taking with him his brother Antony and a sister, he proposed to find a home in Strasburg or Basel. The direct way through Lorraine was then closed by the war between Francis I. and Charles V., and Calvin came around by way of Geneva, where he arrived in August, 1536.

Farel learned of Calvin's presence in the city and visited him at his lodgings. What first impressions may have been made on the veteran reformer by the pale, thin, feeble-looking student we do not know; but as the interview proceeded Farel began to urge Calvin to stay at Geneva and take hold of the work. He eloquently set forth its need of a capable leader, a man qualified by education to carry on the work in a way that he and his associates could not. But Calvin was reluctant; he pleaded his youth, his unfitness, and chiefly his love for study, rather than the untried responsibilities of a life of active leadership in difficult affairs. Finally, under a sudden and irresistible impulse, Farel rose and, extending his hand over Calvin, said:¹ "You have no other pretext for refusing me than the attachment which you declare you have for your studies. But I tell you, in the name of God Almighty, that if you do not share with me the holy work in which I am engaged he will not bless your plans, because you prefer your repose to Jesus Christ!" Calvin himself said that this "terrible adjuration" came to him as the voice of God, and that he yielded, believing that it was the divine will for him to take hold of the work at Geneva. So now, with one brief and sharp interruption, that city becomes his home, and, it may almost be said, his kingdom, for the rest of his life.

Politically Geneva was at this time in a state of transition. Practically it was a republic all to itself, for it had recently become free from the control of both the Catholic bishops and the dukes of Savoy, who had quarrelled over it for generations, and it had not yet joined the Swiss Confederation. There were two popular assem-

¹ Beza's *Life* (old French ed.), p. 22.

blies, the Grand Council and a smaller body; and four Syndics constituted the executive arm of the government.

As we have seen in our sketch of Farel, the council had taken charge of both civil and religious affairs, and had established the Reformed faith as the religion of Geneva in 1535. Just one year later Calvin comes on the scene. But things were really in quite a chaotic state, and the new conditions required greater capacity for organization and direction than any of the earlier reformers possessed. Farel was not mistaken in his man.

At the instance of Farel Calvin was appointed by the council a preacher and teacher of theology. The hand of the born leader soon appeared. Not only did preaching and teaching occupy his time, but he drew up a catechism and a confession of faith, and also laid his strong hand to the reformation of morals by rigid church discipline. Geneva was hardly ready for this, and the measures of the reformers provoked such opposition as to lead at last to a revulsion of feeling that ended in the election to office of men who disliked the reformers, and finally secured, in 1538, their deposition and banishment. Farel settled at Neuchatel, Calvin at Strasburg, where Butzer and Capito arranged that he should be pastor of a small church of French refugees.

During the years at Strasburg (1538-1541) Calvin was busy as preacher and pastor, but also much occupied in theological writing, and in various ways helping on the cause of the Reformation. Here he met and married Idelette de Bure, the widow of a former Anabaptist preacher, and she proved through her life a tender and faithful spouse. But affairs at Geneva deeply concerned him, and his influence was greatly felt. Moral, religious, and political disorder reigned in the city, till, finally, feeling again turned, and first Viret, and then Calvin himself, was called to return and carry on the work of reform.

So in 1541 Calvin is again called as chief preacher and teacher of theology at Geneva. For more than twenty years he filled that post and did a masterly work. We are concerned with him chiefly as a preacher, and it does not fall to this discussion to trace his career as a reformer, as virtual civil guide, if not ruler, of his city, and as theologian and counsellor of the Reformation in many

lands. After Luther's death he was the leading figure among the Protestants, and his influence throughout Europe was immense. The one sad blot upon his great career is the persecuting temper which he shared with many others of his time, and which led (though he was not alone to blame) to the execution of the erratic and surely not admirable Servetus at Geneva. While that execution cannot be justified, at least it should be remembered to Calvin's credit that he tried to keep Servetus from coming to Geneva and sought to mitigate the sentence of burning at the stake which was imposed by the city council. To Calvin himself it was a sad and bitter trial.

Sickness and death came to his people and to his family. One after another his three babes died, and after them the true and faithful wife. His own feeble frame, naturally delicate, and worn down by severe study and overwork, was racked with painful disorders. Yet this man of high conscience and inflexible purpose worked on, preaching in each alternate week every day, besides the usual Sunday services, lecturing nearly every day on theology, attending the meetings of the consistory on the days appointed and guiding its deliberations, visiting the sick of his flock, entertaining visitors, conducting a large and taxing correspondence, and, as if these official duties were not enough, writing his commentaries, revising and republishing his *Institutes* and some other works, and refuting heretics! It is simply marvellous how any one man could have done all he did, and the wonder is intensified when we remember that he was a feeble man, always ailing and often ill. His wonderful memory, his power of concentration, his capacity for affairs, his quick and penetrating intellect, his few hours of sleep, and, above all, the driving wheel of his tremendous will help to explain how he could attend to so much, but even this combination of gifts is itself a marvel.

Labors, sorrows, ill-health, overwork and crushing care must have their victory at last over the frail body that contained a mind and soul so great, and Calvin's end was rapidly approaching. Repeated attacks of illness prostrated him, and in February, 1564, he preached his last sermon. His sickness was long and lingering. The venerable Farel came from Neuchatel to see him, and

their last interview must have been full of tender feeling for both. One day Calvin assembled the councillors of the city about his bed and gave them a parting address and a solemn leave-taking. In the course of his talk to them he said: ¹ "I protest before God that not rashly, and not without being persuaded of the truth, have I taught you the doctrine which you have heard from me; but I have preached to you purely and with sincerity the Word of God according to the charge which he gave me concerning it."

The next day he assembled the "company of pastors," and, after solemnly charging them as to their duties, he likewise bade them farewell. On the twenty-seventh day of May, 1564, he was released from his long and painful struggle and entered into the eternal peace. In accordance with his wishes his funeral services, though largely attended, were without pomp, and no inscription was placed upon his grave. His unmarked tomb has long been lost, but his name is enduringly written in the works that live after him and in the abiding influences of his life and mind.

Calvin had some serious faults of character along with great and masterful virtues. He was irritable, and his anger was often fierce and lasting. But he was conscious and penitent of this and other faults. Pure and austere in morals himself, he was a rigid disciplinarian and lacking in sympathy for the weak and erring. Grave and serious from childhood, he was deficient in geniality, in humor, in gentleness. He seems to have practised reserve and self-repression, but the tenderer sides of his nature would sometimes, though rarely, appear.

Beza somewhere naively remarks that if Farel's fire and Viret's winsomeness had been added to Calvin's qualities the combination would have made a well-nigh perfect preacher. As it was, the defects of Calvin's character showed themselves in his work as a preacher. There is lack of sympathy and charm, deficiency of imagination, sparing use of illustration, no poetic turn, no moving appeal, no soaring eloquence. But, on the other hand, the virtues of the man and the endowments of the intellect were great and telling. Courage, candor, love of truth,

¹ Quoted in Beza's *Life of Calvin*.

devotion to duty, fidelity to principle and to friends, earnestness of purpose, consecration to God and absorption in his work—these and other splendid traits make us almost forget the defects that have been mentioned. And his marvellous intellect—capacious, penetrating, profound—so wins admiration that we have to remember that in him sympathy and imagination were not equal to reason and insight.

In Calvin's preaching the expository method of the Reformation preachers finds emphasis. His commentaries were the fruits of his preaching and lecturing, and his sermons were commentaries extended and applied. Mostly in the homily form of verse by verse comment, there is yet in them a march of thought, a logical sequence that simply did not choose to express itself in the scholastic analysis. In truth, this lack of analysis and clearly defined connection is remarkable in a man of Calvin's logical power. It shows how the commentator got the better of the preacher. Yet his sermons are not mere commentaries. There is a quickness of perception, a sureness of touch, a power of expression that unite to make the thought of Scripture stand out and produce its own impression without the aid of the orator's art. The style was clear, vigorous and pointed, without ornament, but chastely and severely elegant; without warmth, but intense and vigorous. We do not wonder that Bossuet, Catholic and orator, should find Calvin's style "*triste*" (sad, gloomy); but Beza, who knew the effect of his preaching, said of him that "every word weighed a pound—*tot verba tot pondera*."¹ Calvin had no striking presence, nor rich and sonorous voice, but he had a commanding will that needed no physical strength to supplement it, and a sustained intensity of conviction that could spare the help of a flowing eloquence.

And so, though the highest qualities of oratory found no place in Calvin's preaching, the power of his thought, the force of his will, the excellence of his style, and, above all, the earnestness with which he made the truth of God shine forth in his words, made him a great preacher and deeply impressed on his hearers the great verities of the Christian faith.

¹ Broadus, *Hist. Prea.*, p. 120.

There were associates and friends of Calvin at Geneva, fellow-laborers in other parts of Switzerland, and, as far as persecution permitted, in France. These noble and useful men preached the Reformed doctrines and cared for the churches of that faith, but none of them attained any marked eminence, except Theodore Beza (d. 1605),¹ the admirer, friend, associate, and successor of Calvin at Geneva, whom Christlieb describes as "the many-sided professor, church leader and tireless preacher." Born of gentle parents at Vezelay, in old Burgundy, Beza was educated at Paris and Orleans. He was designed for the bar, but preferred literature, and was a poet in Latin and French while yet a youth in the gay Parisian world. An illness turned his thoughts to God and the Reformed faith, and upon his conversion he went to Calvin at Geneva. He was gladly welcomed, and soon a place was found for him with Viret at Lausanne, where he taught Greek, expounded the Scriptures, and carried on Marot's translation of the Psalter. He was active in efforts to help the Reformation by writings and conferences, in which his birth and breeding helped the cause. In 1559 he was called to Geneva to teach Greek and help Calvin. He was also installed as one of the pastors, and his preaching was frequent and effective.

His learning and eloquence gave him great influence, and in 1561 he was summoned to take part for the Huguenots in a famous colloquy called by Catherine de Medici, the queen mother, to be held at Poissy, near Paris. Beza achieved notable success in his oration and conduct, but, of course, the Catholics took care that nothing should come of the colloquy in favor of the Protestants. Beza remained in France many months, laboring for his brethren, but at last returned to Geneva, where he was soon called to succeed Calvin as leader. His long and busy life as preacher, theologian, scholar, disputant, continued over into the seventeenth century.

We have little means of judging of his powers as a preacher, for few of his sermons remain, and these are not important. But his labors in the pulpit were great and fruitful. Baird² says of his speaking that even his

¹ Article by Heppe in Herzog; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.*, Vol. VII., p. 846 ff; Baird's *Rise of the Huguenots*, passim.

² *Rise of the Huguenots*, I., p. 523 ff.

enemies "could not help admitting that he had a fine presence, a ready wit, and keen intellect, and that his excellent choice of language *and ready utterance entitled him to the credit of eloquence.*"

Besides the great leaders of the Reformation and their more immediate associates in those lands where the reform movement had its origin and chief strength, there were in other parts of the Continent of Europe and among the sects in various lands some notable preachers who claim notice at our hands. We begin with those of Spain and Italy.

4. REFORMATION PREACHERS IN SOUTHERN EUROPE.

Under the pious Catholic Queen Isabella and the learned Cardinal Ximenes there was serious attempt to reform the Catholic church itself in Spain, and this effort naturally included the suppression of heresy as well as the correction of abuses. If the one side of the work satisfied many who wished to see a reformation, so the other discouraged, and by the horrors of the Inquisition persecuted and destroyed those who would have a reformation in any other than a strict Catholic sense. Yet, notwithstanding these fearful odds there were some, even in Spain, who preached the evangelical doctrines.¹

The pious and devoted Juan de Avila, called the "Apostle of Andalusia," though not a Protestant, preached a much purer gospel than most of his Catholic brethren, and among other things urged upon the people the study of the Bible. But a more pronounced reformatory impulse came from Rodrigo Valer of Seville. He was a wealthy, handsome, popular young man of the world, who suddenly for some reason withdrew from social life and devoted himself to the study of the Scriptures. He became convinced of the evangelical doctrines, and began boldly to teach them both in personal interviews and by addressing the people as he could in public. He also sought personal acquaintance with the clergy, and influenced them toward reformed opinions. His activity, for he was very bold,

¹ In addition to the church histories, encyclopædias, etc., I have found help in Stoughton's *Spanish Reformers*, Lond., 1883; Jules Lassalle's *La Réforme en Espagne*, Paris, 1883; and in an anonymous French work on the same subject published in 1827.

soon attracted the notice of the Catholic authorities, and he was imprisoned, but he was strong and defiant in his views and would not recant nor modify them. He was punished in various ways besides imprisonment. One penalty was that he had to wear a *sanbenito*, or garb of a condemned prisoner, attend mass and hear sermons. But on one occasion he broke in upon the preacher and disputed his doctrine, and after that he was more closely confined. He died in prison when about fifty years old.

Profoundly influenced by Valer was Juan Gil, better known as Dr. Egidio, who was born in Arragon, had greatly distinguished himself as a student at the University of Alcala and had become canon of the cathedral at Seville about 1537. Here he was already attracting notice as a skilled theologian and a speaker of unusual gifts, but was discouraged as to the fruits of his preaching. Valer and he got together somehow, and the intrepid lay evangelist told Gil that his preaching lacked the true gospel element. Egidio began to study the Bible more, and soon his preaching took on a new character. It became warm, evangelical, truly eloquent; and crowds attended his sermons. His eloquence attracted the favorable notice of the emperor Charles V., who proposed to make him bishop of Tortosa. Then the opposition broke out. It was recalled that Egidio had visited his friend Valer in prison and had written an earnest apology and plea for that heretic; it was declared that his so popular sermons were charged with the Lutheran heresy, and that he was misleading the people. He was tried, but though nothing was certainly proved against him he was condemned as a suspect, deposed and imprisoned for a year. Some say he recanted, but he spent his imprisonment in writing some commentaries and other works, and the story of his public recantation is probably a perversion of the facts. He seems to have been set at liberty several years before his death and to have preached a little in retired places; but his public ministry was cut short by his condemnation. He died in 1556.

There were two successors of Egidio at Seville who likewise, with more or less clearness, preached the doctrines of reform. Ponce de la Fuente was learned, eloquent and cautious, avoiding open attack upon the Roman

errors but preaching the evangelical doctrines. A writing of his, which he frankly acknowledged, was found; and it contained such plain teaching of Protestant views that he was condemned and imprisoned. After two years of confinement he died. After him came Gregorio Ruiz, who also preached evangelical views; but warned by the fate of his predecessors he was less open and pronounced about it, and managed to escape the Inquisition. Sad was the fate of Carranza, archbishop of Toledo, who had taken a prominent part in the Council of Trent, but was later accused of Lutheranism, and after seventeen years of humiliations, trials and imprisonments died at Rome in 1576. Along with him should be mentioned Augustino Cazalla (1510-1559) who was long a pupil under Carranza, then studied with distinction at Alcala. He was endowed with oratorical gifts and was made court preacher to Charles V. in 1542. He passed nine years with the emperor in Germany and imbibed Protestant views. On his return to Spain he was preacher at Valladolid and undertook to introduce the new views there. But he was not the man for a genuine reformer, and though he gained some converts and preached with zeal for awhile, he was induced under torture to renounce his Protestantism. After death his remains were exhumed and burnt by the Inquisition. With him were associated some others at Valladolid. But in all Spain the officers of the Inquisition were alert, and the persecution of those who dared to teach the Lutheran heresy was vigorous and severe. Reform preaching could not flourish there.

A few words, however, must be said concerning the Spanish exiles who taught and preached in other places the doctrines that were so cruelly suppressed at home. Earliest among these was the celebrated Juan Valdez (c. 1490-1541), whose work at Naples was notably influential in promoting the Reformation in Italy. He and his twin brother Alfonso were of excellent Spanish family at Cuenca, where they were born in the latter part of the fifteenth century. They had good instruction, exhibited great love of learning and were among the most distinguished Spanish humanists. Alfonso held important official positions in the court of Charles V., was often with the emperor in Germany, but had no sympathy for

Luther and his work. Juan, on the other hand, though a very decided humanist and a real friend of Erasmus, advanced very far beyond the Erasmian ideas of reform, and was almost a Protestant. He was not a preacher, but his religious activity, his theological works, and his influence upon preachers and others in Italy were so great that he claims notice here. Some time between 1530 and 1535 he left Spain and took up his residence at Naples, where he does not seem to have had any official or business relations, but to have lived on his income and studied and taught at his pleasure. He was a sort of mystic as well as reformer. He put his Hebrew learning to use by translating the Psalms into Spanish, and his Greek by translating Paul's Epistles and the Gospel of Matthew. He was a man of lovely character, and attracted a large number of friends, especially of pious and learned persons of both sexes. He did not hesitate to teach the evangelical views of Christianity, and his influence on several notable Italian preachers we shall have occasion to recall later.

Juan Diaz was a brilliant and promising young reformer who early came to Germany. He was welcomed and beloved by Butzer at Strasburg, and much was hoped from him in the way of influencing his countrymen, but he was followed by his brother, a fanatical Catholic, who, failing in his effort to bring him back to the old faith, betrayed him and led him to his death at the hands of an assassin. There were also two brothers Enzinas (called also Dryander), who, in Holland and Germany, were distinguished as upholders of reform views. Later was Juan Perez, who had been associated with Egidio and others at Seville, but left Spain in 1551, and came to Geneva, where he was pastor of the Spanish Protestant refugees, afterwards was pastor at Blois, in France, and later still was chaplain of the now widowed Duchess of Ferrara at Montargis. Useful in many ways his most distinguished service was his translation of the Bible into Spanish.

The last to be mentioned is the fruitful and learned author, Cipriano de Valera, who was born at Seville about 1532, early fell under the influence of Egidio, fled to Geneva in 1557, thence went to other parts of Switzerland, to England, and to Holland. He was for three

years pastor of the Spanish refugees in London, and tried by writings to spread reformed opinions in Spain.

In Italy the Reformation had a similar course to that in Spain; a humanistic impulse, a reform party within the church, and a persecuted and exiled little band of true reformers.¹ Several of these are worthy of a longer account than can here be given to them. Paolo Vergerio was a lawyer of ability at Capo d' Istria, but, losing his wife, he came to Rome and entered the service of the church. In 1532 he was papal nuncio in Germany and had interviews with Luther, without yet becoming a Protestant. Returning to Italy he preached awhile at Naples and was made bishop of his native town. In 1540 he was in France with Cardinal Este, and was sent by Francis I. to the diet at Worms, where he met Melancthon and Butzer, and probably Calvin also. He was now much in accord with the reformers, but did not as yet openly avow his opinions. He returned to his diocese and preached them among his people. Called to account, he appealed to the Council of Trent, but was denied a hearing and his case was remanded to the court of the Patriarch of Venice. Vergerio refused to appear before that tribunal, and after awhile, being more and more hunted, he left Italy and went to the south of France, where he preached his views more boldly and became very bitter against Rome. In 1553 he was invited by the Duke of Württemberg to Tübingen. He travelled in other parts of Germany at intervals, and died at Tübingen in 1565. He was rather intemperate in his preaching after he left Italy, and during his earlier career was perhaps not wholly free from dissembling his views for personal safety.

Another reformer was Pietro Carnesecchi, of noble Florentine family, and the friend of Cosimo and Catharine dei Medici. He was honored with various church

¹ Besides numerous general authorities of various sorts, I have had opportunity to consult Tiraboschi's accounts of Vermigli and Ochino in his famous *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, Vol. X. (Milan ed.). Karl Benrath's satisfactory monograph, *Bernardino Ochino von Siena* (of which there is also an Engl. translation) is the standard work on Ochino. Their sojourn in England gives occasion for fine articles in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* on both Vermigli and Ochino.

offices, and was prothonotary under Clement VII. But, disgusted with the corruptions of the papal court, he left Rome and travelled in various parts of Italy, teaching and preaching. He was a man of kindly bearing and manners, and was cordially received everywhere. He came to Naples, and was among those who received instruction and help from Juan Valdez, the pious Spanish scholar, but was not yet ready to break with Rome. He was a friend of Cardinal Pole, and perhaps was hopeful of seeing reforms carried out in the church. He paid two visits to France, and from the second, having become more pronounced, he returned to Italy and remained for awhile at Venice. Finally he came once more to Florence, where the Medici tried to shield and save him, but having at last openly avowed Protestant principles, he fell under the sentence of the Inquisition and was executed.

More important than either of these was Pietro Martire Vermigli, who was born of good parents at Florence in 1500. His father was an admirer of Savonarola, and named his son for St. Peter the Martyr, honored among Dominicans. At the age of sixteen Pietro entered the Dominican order and distinguished himself for diligence in study, piety and eloquence. He was early appointed to teach and preach. While preaching with great acceptance at Naples, he came under the influence of Juan Valdez, and adopted decidedly evangelical sentiments. At Lucca he began openly to preach his new views, and with such success that he soon fell under the ban of the Inquisition, and was a marked man. Being at Florence in 1542, he foresaw what would befall him, and decided to escape. He fled with a companion to Switzerland, and was first at Zürich, then at Basel, and was finally at Strasburg with Butzer. Capito's death had left a vacancy there, and Vermigli for several years filled the post of lecturer in theology at Strasburg. In 1547 he was invited by Cranmer, along with Ochino, to become professor of theology at Oxford, a position which he filled with credit till the Catholic reaction under Mary forced him to leave England.

Vermigli then returned to Strasburg, and later went to Zürich, where he died in 1562. Vermigli was a man

of pure character, fine learning, and of good gifts as a speaker. His enemies could find fault only with his doctrine. Even Tiraboschi, who writes as a Catholic, admits that he was a pious and learned man, far removed from the "arrogance and fury of Luther," whose chief fault was that he "undertook to defend and sustain the worse cause."

The most powerful preacher among the Italian reformers was the celebrated Bernardino Ochino (c. 1487-1564), who was born at Siena, and named for the famous preaching saint of a former age. Ochino was not his family name, but how he got his surname and its significance are matters of dispute. Not much is known of his childhood and youth. He early joined the Franciscan order in the branch of Observants, and later passed into the more strict ascetic branch of the Capuchins. He was twice elected general of his order, the second time much against his will. Ochino, following his natural bent as well as conviction, interpreted strictly the principle of his order in regard to preaching, and early and continuously devoted himself to that work. He preached with power and acceptance in many of the cities of Italy, and his services were in great demand for the special church seasons. His strict life and fervid zeal also won for him the reputation of sanctity. After he went over to Protestantism the Catholics (even Tiraboschi) have represented his early piety as hypocrisy, but though he was a man of strong impulses and perhaps of some inconstancy, there is no sufficient reason to doubt his sincerity and earnestness. In 1538 he came for the first time to Venice, where he made a deep impression, not only on the crowds of people who came to his sermons, but on the upper and learned classes also. The eminent humanist, Cardinal Bembo, testified in many extant letters to the wonderful ability of Ochino as a preacher, and had him to come back to Venice the next year and after. Among other things Bembo is quoted as saying,¹ "I confess that I have never heard anyone preach more usefully and more savingly than he. . . . He reasons very differently and in a much more Christian way than all others who have ascended the pulpit in my days, with more of living

¹ Tiraboschi, Vol. X., p. 539 seg.

grace and love, and with better and more acceptable topics."

Another Catholic contemporary, quoted by Benrath, declares that Ochino "left out the wordy war of the Scholastics, which others brought into the pulpit, and preached with spirit and warmth;" and an enthusiastic hearer said, "He might even move stones to tears." Other such testimonials sustain the judgment of Benrath that Italy had had no such preacher since Savonarola. Nine of these early sermons were published at Venice in 1539, and, judging from the extended extracts given by Benrath, and his good discussion of them, and making the necessary allowances for the difference between printing and delivery, they sustain Ochino's reputation. They are not unlike contemporary sermons in form, have a good deal of Scripture quotation, well handled, and are given in a plain, popular style, with fervor, practical point, and a spiritual aim.

Ochino's conversion to Protestantism was not surprising. Already his preaching sounded out the evangelical note of repentance and faith, as opposed both to the moral decay and the work-righteousness of the time. During his several preaching engagements at Naples, along from 1536 to 1540, he was much associated with Valdez and Vermigli, as with kindred spirits, and doubtless received decided influence from them. His preaching after this began to show more and more of the reformatory element. At Venice, early in 1542, he espoused the cause of a preacher who had been punished for proclaiming evangelical opinions, and in the Lent of that year Ochino himself more distinctly and powerfully set forth the main truths of the Reformation. This led the Catholic authorities to action. He was summoned to Rome "on matters of importance." He hesitated, but decided to go, delaying first at Bologna and then at Florence. It became more and more evident to him and his friends that if he went to Rome he must either renounce his convictions or be put to death. At Florence he met Vermigli, who had already determined to leave Italy. Ochino, after a final struggle, decided to do likewise, and in a few days after Vermigli he too fled.

The rest of his life was full of vicissitude, and its close

pathetic in the extreme, but we can only give here a very brief summary of the remainder of his days. Ochino came to Geneva, where, favored by Calvin and the council, he preached to the Italian refugees, wrote some books, and published some sermons for distribution in Italy. They naturally show now, along with his accustomed fire, more of polemic against Rome and more firmness in the reformed doctrines. After about two years in Geneva Ochino came, after stopping a little at Basel and Strasburg, to Augsburg, where, in 1545, he became pastor of the Italian refugees, and labored as pastor, author and preacher till, in 1547, he and Vermigli, both at Cranmer's invitation, came to Oxford as professors. The reaction under Mary drove them both away, and Ochino came back, first to Basel and then to Zürich. He was now quite old, and in his later writings and teachings had broached opinions on the person of Christ and on the Trinity that were somewhat doubtful, though it is not proved that he held, as accused, decided Socinian views on these subjects. Further, though after his flight from Italy he had married, and there never was any just imputation upon his own life, he had in conversation and in a published dialogue on marriage let fall some expressions that seemed to admit in a speculative way the admissibility of polygamy in certain cases. These views, exaggerated no doubt and largely misunderstood, even by such men as Beza and Bullinger, brought Ochino into suspicion and disfavor with the Protestant leaders. The Zürich council finally denied him a place as preacher and advised him to leave. In his old age, thus discredited, and cumbered with his family, he turned to friends that he had among the Italian fugitives in Poland, and went thither, hoping to find refuge and a place to work on for his few years more of life. His old Catholic enemies in Italy rejoiced over Ochino's dismissal from Zürich as evidence of his thorough apostasy and untrustworthiness, and as corroboration of their many slanders against him. Nor did their enmity stop here, but they procured the enactment of an ordinance by the King of Poland forbidding anti-Catholics of foreign birth to settle and teach in his dominions. And thus once more the poor old man was a fugitive. Some obscurity rests over the fate of his

family and over the details of his own closing days, but it appears that he died alone at Schlackau, in Moravia, toward the end of the year 1564. It was a sad ending to what was in many ways a brilliant and noble career. Faults, no doubt, Ochino had, and it would be unsafe to say that the judgment of his critics was utterly without foundation; but there is no doubt as to the devotion of his life to his views of truth, as to the earnestness and sincerity of his labors, and as to his distinguished ability as a preacher.

5. REFORMATORY PREACHERS IN EASTERN EUROPE.

In the parts of Europe which lay immediately to the east of the centers of the Reformation there were not wanting preachers of character and ability, who set forth the Word of God in the spirit and methods peculiar to the reformers. Few, if any, however, were distinguished by commanding powers in the pulpit, or have as preachers secured a world-wide and lasting fame. We may mention a few of the better known men in connection with their countries.

In Bohemia the followers of Huss became divided, but those who remained nearest to his aims and spirit seem to have been among the Bohemian brethren in the later fifteenth century. Among these Rokytana and Chelchitsky were leaders and preachers, and after them Matthias of Kunewald. Among their successors the doctrines of Luther received recognition, but no great preachers were developed. We must not forget, however, the excellent German preacher at Jaoachimsthal, John Mathesius (1504-1565), the pupil and friend of Luther, who spent all his working life in this pastorate. He was a much loved pastor and a studious, earnest and instructive preacher. Though a learned scholar, he knew how to speak to the people and give them in lively images, comparisons, proverbs and for the most part, in simple style, sound instruction from his pulpit. His seventeen biographical sermons on Luther are unique in their way, and are among the most valued sources for the life of the great reformer.

Two Austrians, Primus Truber and Hans Steinberger, are mentioned as having preached with some success the

doctrines of the Reformation in their own country and in Hungary. But the leading place among Hungarian reformers is held by Matthias Birò Dévày (died c. 1547), who is called the "Hungarian Luther." Dévày was born of good Hungarian family at Siebenburgen toward the end of the fifteenth century. After childhood he studied at Cracow, and was a monk and priest in the Roman church till as late as 1527. Meantime, in spite of severe repression, the reformed views had been making some headway in Hungary. At Ofen, now Buda-Pest, the famous Protestant scholar and teacher, Simon Grynæus, later settled at Basel, had taught for awhile, but had been forced out because of his religious views. Here, also, Paul Speratus, who had been driven from Vienna, had preached. Dévày became much inclined to the Lutheran opinions, and in 1529 went to Wittenberg to study with Luther and Melanchthon. After two years he returned to Ofen, but his activity was so great that the Catholics used their power to have him sent away. He labored in several places, suffered several imprisonments, and, finally, went on another visit to Germany and extended it to Switzerland, where he became more inclined to the Swiss ideas of the Lord's Supper than to Luther's. Returning to Hungary, he labored in various ways and places till his death, about 1547. No sermons of Dévày have come down, but he was diligent in preaching, and doubtless preached with power.

In Poland there were Italian refugees, Vergerio among them, who preached the Reformation; and, besides the orthodox, there were also followers of the Socini. But the best-known native reformer was the famous scholar and theologian, John à Lasco (1499-1560), who came of excellent family at Warsaw, was well educated, and for a time served as priest in his native land. About 1539 he became a Protestant, and, having to leave Poland, he labored for about ten years as pastor at Emden, in Friesland. Thence he came in 1549 to England, where he was pastor of a church of refugee Protestants of various nationalities in London. While in England he was much engaged in literary work for the Reformation, and was associated both with the English Protestants and with Butzer, Vermigli and other foreign reformers, till these

were forced to leave by the change of policy on the accession of Queen Mary. A Lasco came to Denmark, then to his old home at Emden, and lastly to Poland, where, as Superintendent of the Reformed churches, he was permitted to labor to the end of his days in his native land. He was more of a writer, scholar, commentator and church organizer than preacher, and no sermons remain to give a fair notion of his pulpit powers. But as pastor and reformer he was active in preaching, and his other work shows that he was a thinker and expounder of excellent ability.

Albert of Brandenburg, who held Prussia for the Teutonic Knights, on becoming Protestant, made the province a dukedom, married and founded a family. Bishop George of Polentz aided Albert in introducing the Reformation. From him several sermons, of no special importance, remain. But Luther sent several preachers to aid in the work, the principal one of whom was John Briessmann (1488-1549), who did much by word and work to establish the Reformation in Prussia. After him came the contentious Osiander, from Nuremburg, but his polemical nature and preaching were not of the highest value to the cause.

More influential and notable as a preacher was Paul Spretter, Latinized into Speratus (1484-1551). He was a native of Swabia, was educated in Italy and at Paris, and early embraced the Protestant doctrines. He preached at various places in southern Germany with good effect, and as early as 1521 was found at Vienna, where in reply to a monk who had defended celibacy Speratus preached a powerful sermon, in which he not only showed that the Catholic practice was contrary to Scripture, but also took occasion to attack the whole system of vows as held in the Roman church. His boldness stirred up the Catholic authorities, and he was summoned to answer charges of heresy, but instead of appearing for trial he left Vienna and was promptly excommunicated. He was called to Ofen (Buda-Pest), but the opposition prevented his settling there, so he turned about and, as he passed through Moravia, going to Germany, he stopped at Iglau, where he was persuaded to remain and preach. This he did so well that he bound the Iglau congregation to him

with an enduring affection, but also roused the determined opposition of the Catholic party. This led the authorities after several years to send him away, but he held the love of his flock, and they had a mutual compact that he should serve them again if better times permitted. So, in 1523, Speratus came to Wittenberg, where in various ways he aided Luther and the others till in the next year he was called to Königsberg, in Prussia. Going by Iglau he was released by his old flock there and took up his residence as court preacher in the ancient capital of the duchy of Prussia. For six years he was court preacher there, and then was appointed by Albert bishop (or superintendent) of Pomerania. Altogether he labored for twenty-seven years in Prussia, and did a great work as organizer of the churches, hymn-writer and popular and beloved preacher. The Protestant cause in Prussia owed much to the wise, patient and faithful labors of Paul Speratus.

6. REFORMATORY PREACHERS IN NORTHERN EUROPE

In the countries to the north of the centers of Protestantism there was progress in the spread of reformatory opinions, and there were preachers to proclaim and teach them. These preachers labored in the spirit and methods of the German and Swiss reformers, those in the Netherlands, at first Lutheran, becoming at last Calvinistic.

Among the preachers of the Low Countries mere mention ¹ may be made of Jan Arends, Peter Gabriel, Nicholas Scheltius, and of Peter Datheen, who is specially noted by Van Oosterzee and Christlieb as a popular preacher of excellent gifts and wide influence. There was also at Oudenarde a man of special merit, Herman Modet (c. 1566), who preached on one occasion in a great assembly near Ghent, where in their hunger for the Word of God the crowded people listened to him for hours at a time. The pastor at Utrecht, Guibert Duis-huis, was also a man of influence, and in his doctrinal views was a forerunner of the later Remonstrants.

But in those dreadful days of persecution and trial, which marked the early history of the Reformation in

¹ Christlieb in Herzog, as before; Van Oosterzee in the historical sketch prefixed to his *Practical Theology*.

the Netherlands, there was little opportunity for the development of distinctive pulpit eloquence. The martyrs were the best preachers. The story of one of the earliest of these will serve as a pathetic illustration of the class.¹ Thus runs the account of old Gerard Brandt, the historian of the Dutch Reformation: "John of Backer, who was not yet twenty-seven years old, was tied to a stake, strangled, and reduced to ashes, in the month of August, 1525. He suffered death for having preached in spite of the prohibitions, and because he was married. His examiners had several conferences with him during his imprisonment. They undertook to prove that a man should submit to all the decrees and traditions of the Romish Church, that heretics should be repressed and exterminated by the sword, and that priests should not marry. The preacher answered that he did not recognize any other rule of faith than Holy Scripture, and that it was not necessary to use other language than that of Scripture itself in order to interpret it; that a man should not rashly violate the decrees and canons, but should observe them when they were in accord with the Word of God; that violence should not be employed in religion, but rather gentleness and force of arguments. He complained that there was too much indulgence for the unchastity of priests, while chaste and honorable marriage, such as God approved, would not be tolerated. . . . On the fifteenth of September the prisoner was degraded from his rank [stripped of his priest's garments] on a scaffold and clothed with a yellow garment and hat of the same color, and then led to execution. In passing before the prison where a number of persons were confined for the faith he cried, in a loud voice, 'See, my brethren, I am ready to suffer martyrdom. Have courage as faithful soldiers of Jesus Christ, and, encouraged by my example, defend the truths of the gospel against all injustice.' The prisoners had no sooner heard these words than they clapped their hands and made great shouts of triumph, and to honor the martyrdom of their friend they sang the *Te Deum*, the *Certamen Martyrum*, the hymn *O Beata Martyrum Solemnia*, and their songs did not cease

¹ From the abridged French edition of Gerard Brandt's *History of the Reformation in the Netherlands*, Vol. I., p. 27 ff.

till the martyr had expired. When he was tied to the stake he cried, 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Death is swallowed up in the victory of Jesus Christ.' At last the martyr died, after having pronounced these words, 'Lord Jesus, forgive them, for they know not what they do. O son of God, save me! Have mercy on me!' Such was the end of John of Backer. He was the first who suffered martyrdom in Holland for the doctrine of Luther." We do not know how much or how well this young man may have preached before this, but certainly this was a sermon of supreme eloquence; and the bloody work of persecution in the Netherlands gave only too frequent and sad occasions for many such sermons.

In Denmark the Reformation early gained a footing, and John Bugenhagen was called by King Christian to regulate the Lutheran churches there. Among the native preachers are mentioned Hans Tausen (d. 1561),¹ bishop of Ripen, who was noted for his "fresh, clear and edifying expositions of the Scriptures in forcible speech." His contemporary, Peter Palladius (d. 1560), bishop of Seeland, is also named as a preacher of popular power. Thus the distinctive type of Reformation preaching did not lack in Denmark its able representatives.

In Sweden also this was true, and, besides others, there were the brothers Olaf and Laurent Petri, who have been called "the Luther and Melanchthon of Sweden."² Olaf Petri (1497-1552) was born at Erebro, the son of a blacksmith, was educated among the Carmelite friars, but later went with his younger brother, Laurent, to Wittenberg, where they were taught by Luther and the other reformers, and came back to labor for the Reformation in their own country. Olaf became rector of a school at Strengnas in 1523, and combined preaching with his work. Here he gained a helper and able reformer in Laurent Andræ. Later Olaf was appointed preacher at Stockholm, from whence as a center his principal work was done. He was a fiery and sometimes rash and imprudent man, bringing upon himself and his cause the usual opposition and evils resulting from that temper and method.

¹ Christlieb, *op. cit.*

² Christlieb, *op. cit.*, and several encyclopædia articles.

But he was brave and true, and a preacher both of learning and popular power. There remain from him both sermons and expository homilies which are said to indicate ability of no mean order in the pulpit.

Of a different stamp was the younger brother, Laurent Petri (1499-1573), who was also educated at Wittenberg, was rather more of a scholar than Olaf, and decidedly of a milder and more moderate nature. Gustavus Vasa appointed him preacher at Upsala, and in 1531 made him archbishop there. He was very useful, both as preacher and prelate, and did especially valuable service by his Bible translations. He was benevolent and conciliatory. From him, as from his brother, there remain both sermons and *postils*, or expository homilies, those on the Gospels being mentioned as of considerable excellence.

7. THE ANABAPTISTS AND OTHER SECTS IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES

Besides the better known and more widely influential preachers who represent one or other of the three leading phases—Lutheran, Zwinglian, Calvinistic—of the Reformation in Europe, there were numerous others, belonging to smaller sects, or representing only themselves and their following, who should be remembered. Naturally, these were very various in character, doctrines and abilities, and were found in different countries; but they may better be considered in a brief treatment together, and thus our survey of the reformation preaching on the Continent of Europe may be concluded.

Amid many persecutions both before and after the time of the Reformation the ancient Waldensian churches maintained themselves in their Piedmont valleys. We have seen how Farel and Saunier paid their synod a helpful visit in 1532 and encouraged them. Other reformers also took an interest in them, but it appears that not until they were permitted to build churches, about 1555, did preaching among them begin to assume a more dignified form than the simple hortatory homilies of their devotional meetings. In later times they have had several preachers of note.

It was not surprising that the Reformation should have

given encouragement by its revolt from Rome to many fanatics and extremists of various sorts. Among these were some men of decided abilities as preachers and popular leaders, but their faults and excesses hindered their own success, and also, to some extent, compromised and greatly embarrassed the leaders of the Reformation. Among the more extreme may be named, without discussion, the imprudent Carlstadt, whose actions were a great annoyance to Luther and the rest; the so-called Zwickau prophets, who believed in an immediate inspiration; and the ill-fated Thomas Münzer, who, along with many hurtful errors, held also some important truths and led the peasants' uprising to disastrous defeat. Later than these were the so-called "Mad Men of Münster," who disgraced the Anabaptist name and cause by their wild excesses, and who carried with them—reluctantly as it seems in most things—at least one preacher of no little eloquence and influence, Bernard Rothmann. Others who were more or less associated with the Anabaptists and had some talent as popular preachers were Melchior Hoffman, who led a very unsettled life, and was not a man of much culture, but yet knew how to reach and influence people; and the erratic David Joris of Holland, who likewise was a wanderer, but an attractive personality and a sensational and bold speaker.

The name Anabaptist has been applied with little discrimination to a variety of sectaries in the sixteenth century. It was not a name of their own choosing, but was bestowed by their enemies to indicate that they were the rebaptizers, those who insisted that all who had received baptism in infancy should, on conversion, be baptized again. But both the name, and the conception involved in it, does an injustice. These men insisted that infant baptism was unscriptural and therefore no baptism at all, that only repentant and believing persons should be baptized upon profession of faith. But of those who adopted this principle not all held the same views in other respects. Especially is it necessary to distinguish the fanatical and revolutionary element from the more conservative. It is not just to charge all with the errors and excesses of some, and it is only historically fair to recognize that there was no general and well defined body of Anabap-

tists, but that the name was loosely applied to many different varieties. But partisanry is not discriminating, and so it is true that many deserving men have been called by this name of reproach and accused of crimes which they reprobated.

The Swiss Anabaptists were not of the revolutionary character of Münzer and the men of Münster, but they were stout in their opposition to infant baptism and to the union of church and state, and so they were persecuted and repressed by the civil authorities under the advice of Zwingli and other reformers.

In regard to preaching, there was among them a custom of mission, itinerant preaching—a view that ordination was not vitally necessary, and that lay preaching, even by those who had no learning, was permissible.¹ Hence we find among the Swiss Anabaptists some who were not highly educated, but yet were effective preachers, as Blaurock and others. But, on the other hand, Reublin, Grebel and Mantz were cultivated and able men and strong preachers. In Moravia, Friesland and Holland, also, there were not a few preachers of good learning and popular power among these persecuted people. We may select two of the most eminent for a somewhat more extended notice—Hübmaier and Menno.

Prominently identified with both the Swiss and the Moravian Anabaptists was the scholarly and eloquent Balthasar Hübmaier (d. 1528), who was born at Friedberg, near Augsburg, about 1480. He studied at Freiburg under John Eck, taught school at Schaffhausen for awhile to help pay expenses at the university, and in 1512 followed Eck to Ingolstadt, where he was for a time pastor of the town church and professor in the university. His preaching power was already recognized and he was called in January, 1516, to be cathedral preacher at Regensburg, where he worked for some years. One token of his power over men by speech was the fact that his preaching against the Jews led to their being banished from the town; their synagogue was destroyed, and on the site a chapel was built to the Virgin. But this led to

¹ My colleague, Dr. W. J. McGlothlin, has brought out some interesting facts, including this, in his thesis—on the Bernese Anabaptists—presented with success to the University of Berlin for the Doctorate in 1902.

pilgrimages and other superstitious excesses, and Hübmaier began to oppose these things. Thus he was making a slight beginning toward the reformatory doctrines. Some opposition developed and he was led to accept a preaching appointment at Waldshut in 1521. His study of the Bible and of Luther's writings accelerated his conversion to the principles of the Reformation. He returned to Regensburg for a few months, but his preaching was now so decidedly reformatory that he could not remain there, and came back again to Waldshut. This town was under the Austrian dominion, but was near the Swiss border and not far from important places in Germany. During this second and more extended pastorate at Waldshut Hübmaier's character and convictions as a reformer became settled. His reformatory zeal and his powerful preaching began to tell, and his work resulted in the adoption of the Reformation by the church and people of Waldshut in 1524.

Up to this point Hübmaier was in sympathy with Zwingli, and the Waldshut reform was effected in the Swiss mode. But about now the question of infant baptism began to agitate the Swiss reformers. Zwingli himself entertained for a while serious doubts as to the rightfulness of the practice. Œcolampadius, too, was not wholly convinced. Leo Jud long wavered, and the gentle Capito could always see that there were two sides to the Anabaptist controversy. The question was never decided on its merits, but imprudences on the part of the Anabaptists, and their stubborn opposition to authority, complicated the situation and made it largely a semi-political and partisan strife, wherein men's passions were aroused to punish and resist, and thus disastrous results followed. Hübmaier early became convinced that infant baptism was contrary to Scripture, and began so to teach. In 1525 he received baptism at the hands of William Reublin, and led the majority of the Waldshut church to adopt the Anabaptist view of the Reformation. Meantime he ably held his own with Zwingli, Œcolampadius and others in discussing the question, both orally and in writings. But the issue went against the Anabaptists; they were compromised with the Peasants' War, and its disastrous and bloody ending hurt

their cause. Waldshut lacked now the sympathy of Zürich, fell into the hands of the princes, and, being under Austrian control, was forcibly subjected to the Catholic party. Thus ended the Reformation there, and Hübmaier was forced to flee. Now comes a dark place in his career, which it is difficult to comprehend and explain.

Hübmaier came to Zürich, where he was secretly received by friends, but was discovered by the authorities and put on some kind of trial. It is said that he asked the privilege of making a public recantation of his Anabaptist views, and, on being permitted to preach for this purpose at the Grossmünster, he played false, and, instead of renouncing his views, proceeded to defend them with his wonted eloquence and cogency. Afterwards, on being reproached for his breach of promise and of propriety, he is reported to have said that it must have been the suggestion of the devil that made him do so. All the time he was arguing the case with Zwingli and others, and finally it is claimed that he did renounce his Anabaptist views, satisfied the Zürich authorities, and with permission, and perhaps pressure, to depart, received from them money for his journey, and left the city. If the statements of his opponents are to be taken without allowance, Hübmaier certainly does not appear well in this affair. But his side of the controversy has not been written, and from a statement that he boasted at Constance of having come off victor over Zwingli in the arguments, we may infer that his alleged recantation at Zürich was more apparent than real. At the same time it seems impossible to acquit him of some insincerity and diplomacy in the trying and perilous situation in which he was placed. As to the provision of his travelling expenses from Zürich, it is easy to suppose that the authorities may not have been wholly disinterested in helping the redoubtable champion of Anabaptism to get away.

After brief stops at Constance and other places, Hübmaier came at last, in July, 1526, to Nikolsburg, in Moravia, where the Anabaptists had some strength. Here he received protection from a nobleman, who sympathized with the Anabaptists, and was enabled to set up a printing press and publish his writings. Here, also, he was

pastor of the congregation, and speedily, by his rare qualities of speech and persuasion, brought great numbers to accept his views. The Anabaptist cause became very strong throughout all that region. But, unhappily, some rash spirits troubled the prosperity of the movement, and at this juncture Moravia passed from Bavarian to Austrian rule, and persecution began. Hübmaier was promptly called to account. No doubt the Catholic opposition was at the bottom, and it was a religious persecution, but Hübmaier's work at Waldshut gave pretext for accusing him of having occasioned the revolt of that city and of complicity in the peasant uprising of 1525. He was imprisoned, and after various ineffectual efforts to get release, but bravely and immovably refusing to retract his religious convictions, he was condemned. So on a public square in Vienna he was burned, March 10, 1528, his faithful wife encouraging him. He met his end with a martyr's steadfastness; and his noble wife a few days later was drowned in the Danube.

All the accounts agree that Hübmaier was a forcible and eloquent preacher. Œcolampadius, Vadian, even Bullinger, bear emphatic testimony to this effect, and the results of his work at every place where he served as pastor show that he had unusual power of influencing men to action by his preaching. Among his writings it does not appear that any sermons remain, but of one of his works Broadus says,¹ "I find a really beautiful address (A.D. 1525) to the three churches of Regensburg, Ingolstadt and Freiburg, entitled *The Sum of a Truly Christian Life*, to be of the nature of a sermon. The arrangement is good and the divisions distinctly stated. He is decidedly vigorous and acute in argument, making very sharp points. The style is clear and lively; when he has begun you feel drawn along, and want to follow him."

Another man of great popular power and influence, commonly reckoned with the Anabaptists, was Menno Simons (1492-1559), whose work was chiefly in Friesland, Holstein and the adjoining regions, reaching also into Holland. He was the founder of the sect called Mennonites, who have maintained a vigorous life to this

¹ *Hist. Prea.*, p. 131.

day, and have a considerable following in the United States. Menno was born in Friesland, educated, and became a priest and a preacher of considerable force in the Catholic church. In 1531 he became parish priest in his native town of Witmarsum, and his development in evangelical opinions soon afterwards began. About this time the execution of a man for holding Anabaptist views made a profound impression on Menno, and led him to investigate the question of infant baptism. But it was only after several years that he became sufficiently convinced to teach these views publicly. He had no sympathy with the Münster fanatics, nor with all who bore the Anabaptist name. Carefully and earnestly he worked out his own position and devoted his life to teaching and spreading the views which he believed to be taught by the Word of God. As his convictions were nearest to those held by the larger number of Anabaptists, there was no impropriety in his taking charge of an Anabaptist church at Groningen in 1537, where he labored for a number of years, not only in his own congregation, but, by visits and numerous writings, in the adjoining regions, and even beyond them. At one time he had a discussion with the eminent theologian John à Lasco, then working at Emden, in Friesland. The debate was characterized by both ability and charity, a combination not always visible in religious disputes then or since. Later, because of persecution, Menno removed to Wismar, and finally settled in Holstein, where he spent the last twelve years of his active life, dying in 1559.

Menno wrote in the Low-German (*plattdeutsch*) dialect, but his writings were done into Dutch and other languages. He was a prolific author, and many of his writings remain. There do not appear to be sermons, strictly speaking, among them, but doubtless many are the outgrowth of his pulpit work. As a preacher he had the character of a mild but well-convinced and firm defender of his views, a faithful and diligent worker, and a man of eloquence and persuasive power over people.

Upon the whole, the preaching of the sectaries, with all its varieties, was true to the fundamental principle of the Reformation—the sole authority of the Word of God as the basis of preaching and of life in the churches. It

also exemplified a noble care for the religious needs of the common people, and displayed a popular power at least not less striking than that of the better known reformers. Altogether those critical years of reform in Europe were strenuous in conflict and in toil, and through their preachers the Word of God came to the people with power.

CHAPTER XIV

PREACHERS OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND

Both the causes and character of the Reformation in Great Britain differed in many important respects from those of the movement on the Continent, and yet there was necessarily very close connection and sympathy between these movements. In both cases the relation between the Reformation and preaching was close and vital. Except Wiclif, there was in England no great preacher before the Reformation; since that time there have been no preachers in all the world who, in the essentials of true pulpit eloquence, have surpassed the English Protestant divines. And, whatever may be the explanation of the singular fact, it is true that no English Catholic preacher has ever occupied corresponding rank with his great Protestant contemporaries in his own land or with his more noted Romanist brethren in others. Cardinal Newman is no exception, because his best pulpit work belongs, not to his Catholic, but to his Anglican days. In Scotland the case is exactly parallel; no great preacher before the Reformation, since then, in the Protestant bodies, a multitude. It is idle to conjecture what might have been the influence on preaching if a purified Romanism had been the modern type of British Christianity, but the fact is that the Reformation produced the modern British pulpit.

I. THE ENGLISH REFORMATION AND ITS PREACHING

No doubt the character of Henry VIII. and his suit for divorce from Katharine of Arragon were very influential in bringing on and shaping the English Reformation; no doubt also the patriotic desire for inde-

pendence of papal authority in England had very much to do with it; no doubt, further, that many churchmen in the country sympathized with both these elements of the situation; but back of all these things there lay in the minds of the great English people a deep discontent with existing religious conditions, and a readiness to be led in mending them. This readiness settled more and more into a fixed and mighty purpose through the troubled reigns of Henry, Edward, and Mary, until it reached its accomplishment under Elizabeth. Not sovereigns, statesmen nor prelates could have wrought out the English Reformation unless there had been among the people themselves an intelligent, vigorous and religiously earnest party of reform, which, though at first not in the majority, yet knew how to make its influence felt. Preaching, as we have seen in our account of Wiclif¹ and his work, had much to do with creating and manifesting this sentiment; and we shall from now on have to consider the great part it played in the powerful movement of the age.² Well says Mr. W. H. Beckett,³ "In an age which was eminently a hearing and not a reading one, the influence of such able and zealous preachers as Latimer, Knox, Ridley, Hooper, Bradford, can scarcely be overestimated. In its preachers rather than its rulers was the strength of the Reformation movement."

The work of Wiclif and the Lollards had by no means spent its force. Beckett shows how the Lollard preaching was most influential in those very regions (mostly in the south and east) where the strength of the Reformation was greatest. He also points out that the lack of records of Lollard persecutions for a long time before the Tudors came to the throne does not, as commonly supposed, indicate that the Lollards had been suppressed; but the cessation of persecution was due to the unsettled state of the country during the Wars of the Roses. As Fuller puts it, "The very storm was their shelter." The revival of persecution under both the Tudor Henrys shows that the Lollards were still in evidence. In their

¹ *Ante*, p. 336 ff.

² I have found great pleasure and help in the brief and popular, but at the same time able and scholarly work of the Rev. W. H. Beckett, *The English Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*.

³ Chap. XX.

preaching they denounced the Romanist doctrines with mighty earnestness and exalted the Scriptures as the sufficient guide to doctrine and duty. This Lollard influence not only disposed the people to desire and hear gladly the evangelical preaching, but also was of force in forming the preachers themselves.

Another highly important sign of the coming change was the reformatory sentiment that found place in both the universities. At Oxford Colet's¹ work was finished on the eve of the Reformation, and his name and influence were by no means forgotten. Cardinal Wolsey had some projects for instituting reforms in the church—disciplinary rather than doctrinal—and it was among his plans to found at Oxford, from the proceeds of certain suppressed monasteries, a new college which should afford a better culture for priests. His career was suddenly cut short, and we do not know what sort of reforms might have come under his guidance. At Oxford Erasmus taught, as well as at Cambridge, during his stay in England. In 1510 his famous satire, *The Praise of Folly*, appeared, with its dedication to Sir Thomas More, and it was much read in England. In 1516, from Basel, his Greek Testament appeared, and had a great influence at both the universities and among the better clergy elsewhere. At Cambridge there was in the early years of the sixteenth century, before the distinctively reformatory events began, a decided tendency in that direction. Several of the most distinguished preachers of the Reformation, as well as others who helped it other ways, were at this time studying and working at Cambridge. Thus, with Lollard sentiments among the people and the new ideas of learning and theology working at both the educational centers of the nation, there were preparatory influences of the first importance for the preaching of the Reformation. That preaching did not begin in any sudden or particularly impressive way, but gradually grew up and gained power by its own momentum, and by the help of other influences as it went on.

We have already had frequent occasion to observe the natural sympathetic relation of preaching to the age in which it finds its exercise; and both in a general way

¹ *Ante*, p. 342.

and in many important particulars this was manifest in the English reformation preaching. That widespread stimulus of thought which came from the discovery of America, the invention of printing, the revival of learning, all in the fifteenth century, left its traces upon the English mind and the English preaching as it did elsewhere, and it may be dismissed with this brief reminder. More immediate was the effect of the course of events in England itself.

The reigns of the four Tudor sovereigns under whom the Reformation occurred afford convenient as well as historically appropriate waymarks to denote its progress and its influence upon preaching. During the reign of Henry VIII. (1509-1547) the personal character of the monarch counted for something in regard to preaching as well as the general progress of the Reformation, for the king was disposed to manage everything in sight, preaching included. But his partiality for Cranmer and respect for Latimer were strong indirect encouragements of the Reformation, though Henry was in doctrine always far more of a Catholic than a reformer. The great reform parliament (1529-1536) was literally the power behind the throne in his reign, and its reformatory acts, especially those suppressing the monasteries, were of profound importance to preaching. But the Six Articles (1539) were decidedly reactionary in doctrine, and made it very dangerous to preach Protestant views. The reign of the boy king, Edward VI.—really a regency or protectorate (1547-1553)—was most favorable to the preaching of the Reformation. The statesmen who guided the policy of England during this time sympathized with the Reformation, and Cranmer was the leading spirit in ecclesiastical affairs. The Six Articles were repealed, Protestant divines from abroad (Butzer, Peter Martyr Vermigli, Ochino, John à Lasco) were invited to England and put in places of influence, and important acts were passed regarding the supply of preachers for the parishes. But there was no unrestricted liberty to preach; license was required before a preacher was permitted to exercise his ministry, and the requirement seems to have been pretty well enforced. Under Mary (1553-1558) two things virtually put a stop to Protestant preaching in England for a

while: (1) the reestablishment of the Catholic worship; and (2) the martyrdom, imprisonment or banishment of the leading Protestant preachers. But in these dark days the nation was being tested for better times, and the effect of the persecution was to aid rather than hinder the establishment of Protestantism in the next reign.

Under Elizabeth, who began to reign in 1558, the restoration of Protestantism was at first compromisingly cautious and slow. Its final establishment occurred in the latter part of her reign. But yet, in her early days, something was gradually done for the rehabilitation of reformatory preaching. The need was indeed great, for the dearth of preachers during the first years of Elizabeth's reign was fearful. At first, to avoid controversies, preaching was forbidden for a while,¹ the church services being confined to the reading in English of the Gospel and Epistles for the day, the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, and the Litany. At St. Paul's Cross—the famous scene of so much preaching in better days—there was no sermon from Christmas to Easter. It is true this prohibition of preaching was only temporary, but it aggravated the trouble occasioned by the general disorganization of worship, the unsettled state of the country, and the paucity of Protestant preachers. Thomas Lever² wrote to Bullinger at Zürich in the second year of Elizabeth's reign: "Many of our parishes have no clergy; and out of that very small number who administer the sacrament throughout this great country there is hardly one in a hundred who is both able and willing to preach the Word of God." This lack of preachers and preaching continued for a long time. Fourteen years after Elizabeth's accession it is said that as many as thirty-four parishes even in the diocese of Canterbury were vacant. In many churches there was only occasional preaching during the year.

Yet some effort was made to repair the dreadful breach caused in the ranks of the clergy by the persecution under Mary. In December, 1559, Parker was made archbishop of Canterbury. The death of Cardinal Pole, who was appointed to succeed Cranmer, spared Protestantism the necessity of deposing him, and perhaps the shame of re-

¹ Beckett, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

² Beckett, p. 274.

taliation for Cranmer's wrongs. The appointment of other prelates and clergy followed rapidly. Grindal, who had been much associated with Ridley, and was a fine preacher, was made bishop of London. Sandys, who was also a preacher of some force, was assigned to the see of Worcester; and Jewel, perhaps the ablest preacher of them all, was created bishop of Salisbury. Both Sandys and Jewel had imbibed the German and Swiss ideas of reform, and were thorough-going Protestants. There were many ordinations and appointments of the lower clergy, and to meet the pressing need a temporary order of readers was instituted to read the services and the homilies without administering the sacraments. Thus slowly and with difficulty did Protestant preaching recover strength in England after the sharp check of those five blighting years of Mary's reign.

Recurring now to the earlier days, we must consider another powerful influence upon the history of reform preaching. Most important service was rendered to the progress of the English Reformation and to its preaching by the translation and dissemination of the Bible, and the production of Protestant literature. The English Bible was one of the Reformation's most precious gifts to the world. The work of translation went on from the days of Wiclif to the publication of the King James Version in 1611; and that crowning achievement, as its familiar title page reminds us, was based on the earliest versions—"With former translations diligently compared and revised." Most of these "former translations" appeared within the time we are now studying,¹ and it is impossible to over-emphasize their importance in the development of Protestant preaching, both as regards the quickening of intelligent spiritual interest in the hearers and the more thorough furnishing of the preachers.

Besides the circulation of the Bible, the production and publication of Protestant literature greatly helped the preaching of the reformed doctrines. Erasmus' *Para-*

¹ Tindale's New Testament, 1525-1529; Coverdale's Bible (entire), 1535; "Matthew's" (probably Rogers' publication of translations left by Tindale and supplemented by portions from Coverdale) soon after; then the "Great Bible," and Cranmer's Bible—all before 1550.

phrase of the New Testament was translated into English and appointed to be read in the churches. Frith's sharp *Disputation of Purgatory* appeared in 1531, and called forth a vigorous defence of the doctrine by Sir Thomas More. Tindale's able statement of the doctrine of justification by faith in his exposition of the *Parable of the Wicked Mammon*, and his more important treatise on the *Obedience of a Christian Man*, were powerful contributions to the Protestant cause, and supplied many a preacher with arguments and reinforcements. The two fundamental principles of the English Reformation—the supremacy of the king in the external government of the church, and the sole authority of Scripture in doctrine—were clearly and strongly set forth in the treatise. In 1537 there was drawn up by a committee of bishops and published a work called *The Institution of a Christian Man*. It contained an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, very largely with a Protestant coloring; though modifications in a later edition under Gardiner's influence made it more Catholic in tone. The book was intended chiefly to instruct the clergy, and was familiarly known as the "Bishop's Book." In its first form it undoubtedly helped the preachers to set forth the evangelical doctrines. The development of the Prayer Book in successive editions and modifications through the reigns of Henry, Edward and Elizabeth, likewise had a relation to preaching in that its being in English helped to popularize worship, and it also recognized the place of preaching in the service.

More directly connected with preaching, however, was the preparation—long apart—of the two books of *Homilies*. The first of these was published in the time of King Edward "for the staying of such errors as were then sparkled among the people." The idea was much like that which lay back of the old Homilies of Ælfric and the later ones of Wiclif; to aid the less cultured preachers in what they should say, or, in the absence of ability, to use the material for fresh sermons, to be read as they were. Three of the twelve are said to have been written by Cranmer; others were contributed by Ridley, Latimer, Butzer, and perhaps others. They set out the principal doctrines of the Reformation very

distinctly. The later book was published after the restoration of Protestantism under Elizabeth, being sanctioned by the Convocation of 1562. The work was done by the prelates of that later date, has a larger number of homilies, and is even more distinctly Protestant in tone. In one way these Homilies helped preaching, that is, by affording material to the uninstructed clergy; in another they injured it, by encouraging dependence upon such helps.

Reformatory preaching in England was characterized by the traits common to that movement in all the European countries, but modified by the language and habits of thought of the people, and by the circumstances attending the origin and development of the English Reformation. The first sermon of the *Book of Homilies*,¹ printed in 1548, is entitled "A Fruitful Exhortacion to the Readyng of Holye Scripture," and declares both the sufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith and the necessity for studying and reading it to the humble as well as to the learned. Thus the cardinal principle of the Reformation is here distinctly laid down, and no doubt was equally emphasized in the sermons by individual preachers. The sermon on Salvation, ascribed to Cranmer, affirms and reiterates the doctrine of justification by faith alone; and the relation of faith and works is thus set forth: "In our justification is not only God's mercye and grace, but also his justice, whiche the Apostle calleth the justice [righteousness] of God; and it consisteth in paynge our raunsome and fulfillynge of the lawe; and so the grace of God doth not exclude the justice of God in our justification, but onely excludeth the justice [righteousness] of man, that is to saie, the justice of our woorkes as to be merites of deservyng our justification. And, therefore, saint Paule declareth here nothyng upon the behalf of man concerning his justification, but onely a true and lively faith, which nevertheless is the gift of God and not mannes onely work without God. And yet that faythe

¹I had the pleasure of using (in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) an ancient edition of the *Book of Homilies* "imprinted at London the XXI daye of Iune in the seconde yere of the reigne of our souvereigne lord kyng Edward the VI; by Rychard Grafton printer to his moste royall maiestie; in the yere of our Lord MDXLVIII."

doeth not exclude repentaunce, hope, love, dread and the feare of God to be joyned with faith in every man that is justified, but it excludeth them from the office of justifyinge. So that, although they be all presente together in him that is justified, yet they justify not altogether." The sermons on faith and good works carry out this idea further, and those on Christian morals are satisfactory.

Of course the *Homilies*, as well as the sermons of Latimer, Bradford and the rest, bring out fully that our sole dependence for salvation is on Christ, and they oppose all externalism. The Romanist doctrines of the mass, transubstantiation, penances, purgatory, papal supremacy, and the like are attacked with the customary Protestant arguments. While the Scriptures are exalted as the rule of faith and are always quoted, and usually, very appositely, there is less of distinctive exposition than in the Lutheran and Reformed sermons. Commentaries could not be constructed from the sermons of the English reformers as they could from those of Luther and Calvin. And the number of preserved sermons is comparatively very small. There are a good many from Latimer, for he had a Swiss friend and secretary who was at pains to write out a large number of them, but from the rest only a very few remain.

Criticisms of individuals will be reserved for the biographical notices, but it may be remarked that from the contemporary accounts, as well as from the remaining specimens of sermons, we see that the English reform preachers held the evangelical doctrine, and they preached it with simplicity and with power. Their courage, constancy, fidelity to truth and duty, and their power to move, win and hold their countrymen, are all apparent in their sermons. To a study of some of these noble men we must now turn.

2. PREACHERS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

At any time in the history of preaching there are distinguished preachers who are not specially distinguished as preachers; their pulpit gifts are not commensurate with their services in other directions. The era of the Reformation in England affords abundant illustration of

this fact, and a few of the preachers of this class must be noticed.¹

We naturally think first of the famous archbishop of Canterbury under Henry VIII. and Edward VI., Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556). The future leader of the English Reformation came of good old family in Nottinghamshire. His mother was left a widow while Thomas was still young, but she cared for his education, sending him to Cambridge at the age of fourteen. Here he remained for eight years, taking the regular degrees in course and being made a fellow of Jesus College. This fellowship he lost through marriage, in accordance with the custom, but was reëlected to it on the early death of his wife. He was thus in residence at Cambridge for a number of years, was made a doctor of divinity and gave lectures on that subject; but when he was ordained a priest and what preaching places he filled in his early career are not mentioned in the accounts of his life.

As is well known, his rapid promotion to high ecclesiastical positions was due to the favor of Henry VIII. because of Cranmer's—no doubt sincere—convictions as to the rightfulness of the king's divorce, and as to the means by which it might be secured. In 1533 Cranmer was made archbishop of Canterbury, and soon thereafter the famous cause was tried before him as Primate of England, and the divorce was granted. Faithful, sometimes indeed subservient, to Henry all his life, Cranmer never lost the favor of his royal patron; and through the reign of the boy king, Edward, he retained and faithfully administered his great office.

Though Cranmer was far from rash or very decided in his reformatory progress, there is no reason to doubt that he was sincere in his growing adhesion to the Protestant views. He was disposed to follow rather than lead in matters of opinion, and he especially deferred much to the wise and learned Ridley. Though not a strong preacher himself, he did occasionally preach. He wrote some of the Homilies; and he gave generous and effective encouragement to such powerful preachers as Latimer, Ridley, Bradford, Grindal and others.

On the accession of Mary, Cranmer was degraded from

¹ In preparing the sketches that follow I have found the articles in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* of especially good service.

his high offices and imprisoned along with Latimer, Ridley and others. From his prison window he was a mournful witness of the martyrdom of his two faithful companions, and in a few months followed in their way. The timidity and weakness which led him to sign a series of recantations of his Protestant views were only atoned for by the brave and pathetic way in which he came to his true self at the end, renounced his weak and insincere recantations, reasserted his real views, and cheerfully died for them. It is easy to criticise the obvious weaknesses of Cranmer—his over-caution, his vacillation, his suberviency—but his virtues should not be forgotten—his kindness, generosity, forgiving disposition; and his great services to the cause of Protestantism in England in the trying days of his life should be fully recognized.

The chief significance of William Tindale (d. 1536) is as a Bible translator and author, but he was also a preacher of promise, and doubtless would easily have attained eminence in that regard had his life-work not been directed in another and extremely useful channel. He was born in the west of England, near the Welsh border, in the ninth decade of the fifteenth century, and after preliminary training studied with marked diligence and success at both Oxford and Cambridge. After taking his degrees he was ordained priest, and taught for a while in the family of a gentleman in Gloucestershire, and preached at various places nearby, including out-of-door services on the College Green at Bristol. His preaching was effective, and as his views were already verging toward reform, the clergy was aroused and had the bold preacher called to account before the bishop. Tindale defended himself with ability and was released. He is said to have remarked to one of his opponents, "If God spare my life ere many years I will cause a boy that directeth a plow shall know more of the Scripture than thou dost." This shows that already he had formed the purpose of translating the Bible into English.

With this great project in his mind he came to London hoping to receive aid and encouragement from the scholarly bishop Tunstall. This was the very Tunstall who a few years later was to buy up and burn a quantity of Tindale's Testaments. Naturally Tindale got no help in that quarter, but having in some way secured a preach-

ing place in one of the London parishes, his sermons attracted notice and won him the fast and helpful friendship of a certain Humphrey Monmouth, who aided him with sympathy and in practical ways. Coming to the conclusion that he could not safely or successfully accomplish his great design in England, Tindale left the country. The first edition of his translation of the New Testament was published at Worms, in Germany, in 1525 or 1526. Later Tindale moved to Antwerp, where a second edition was published in 1529. Meantime his two great Protestant treatises—the exposition of the *Wicked Mammon*, and the *Obedience of a Christian Man*—had appeared, and gave great help to the cause of reform in England. These writings involved him in a vigorous controversy with the accomplished Thomas More, in which Tindale amply sustained himself against that master of dialectic and style.

While residing at Antwerp and working at his translation of the Old Testament, Tindale met and influenced John Rogers, in whose hands he left his uncompleted work. For, in 1535, Tindale was in some way betrayed into leaving the protection of the so-called “English House” at Antwerp, and was captured by the imperial authorities. It was not to the taste of Charles V. or his agents in the Netherlands to have this arch-heretic busily at work at Antwerp. After a period of imprisonment at Vilvorde, and on the refusal of Henry VIII. to interfere in his behalf, Tindale was executed as a heretic in 1536. At the stake he is said to have prayed, “Lord, open the King of England’s eyes.” Tindale was a competent scholar, and much of his interpretation and diction has been retained in all subsequent English versions of the Bible.

Next to Tindale should be named his friend John Rogers (d. 1555), who was born near Birmingham about the beginning of the sixteenth century. He was educated at Cambridge and began his ministry as priest in a small London parish, but on going to Antwerp to serve the English congregation there he came under Tindale’s influence, and probably was thus led to embrace Protestant views. He married, went to Germany, where at Wittenberg he came in touch with the Reformers and put

forth the version of the Bible known as "Matthew's Bible," consisting of Tindale's published and unpublished work, with some parts filled in from Coverdale's version. In 1548, Edward now reigning, Rogers returned to England, and was appointed successively to several different preaching places, the most important being one connected with St. Paul's Cathedral, to which he was assigned by Bishop Ridley.

In his preaching Rogers did not spare the corrupt courtiers about Edward VI., and he thus made some enemies, and was called before the council to answer for some of his utterances. But without cringing or retraction he made so frank and manly a justification of his course that he remained unpunished. In July, 1553, during the brief interval between Edward and Mary, when the unfortunate Lady Jane Grey was acknowledged queen by a small following, Rogers, by order of her council, preached at St. Paul's Cross, but he did not at that time touch upon the political situation. A few weeks later, however, after Mary had been acknowledged queen, he preached again, and this time was not so prudent. According to Foxe,¹ "he made a godly and vehement sermon at St. Paul's Cross, confirming such true doctrine as he and others had taught there in King Edward's days, exhorting the people constantly to remain in the same and to beware of all pestilent popery, idolatry and superstition." It was not wise, perhaps, but it was brave unto daring and faithful unto death—the stake was its earthly, the crown its heavenly, reward. It was Rogers' last sermon. Summoned before the royal council to answer for his conduct, he pleaded that he had only preached the religion established by law; and this was true, for there had not been time to change the reformatory statutes of Edward's reign. But this shrewd plea only embarrassed the persecutors for a time. Rogers was summoned again, confined in his own house, then deprived of his offices as preacher, then imprisoned, several times examined, condemned as a heretic, and after more than a year of trials and imprisonments was finally brought to the stake in February, 1555, the first of that "noble army of martyrs" who suffered under Mary's reign. His wife and

¹ Quoted by Beckett, p. 211.

children spoke to him as he passed to the place of suffering and encouraged him to steadfastness; and De Noailles, the French ambassador, who witnessed the scene, wrote in his report that Rogers "went to his death as though it had been his wedding."

No sermons remain from Rogers to give us an insight into his manner of preaching, but he was held in highest esteem as a preacher by Ridley and other excellent judges; and his courage, fidelity and effectiveness in the pulpit were shown on more than one trying occasion.

A man of very different stamp was Miles Coverdale (1488-1568), also one of the venerated pioneers in English Bible translation, and a preacher of merit and influence. Coverdale was a native of Yorkshire, a graduate of Cambridge, and as early as 1514 an ordained priest. He joined the Augustinian friars and came under the early reformatory influence of Barnes, prior to the abbey of that order at Cambridge. After a time he left the convent and devoted himself to an itinerant evangelizing ministry in different parts of the country. From about 1526 for a year or two there are traces of his activity and success in this work, and then for a long time he disappears from view till the publication of his translation—the first complete one—of the Bible in 1535, just ten years after Tindale's New Testament. During this time Coverdale was probably for the most part abroad and hard at work on his translation. It was published out of England, but the place has been disputed; probably Antwerp has the honor. Coverdale returned to England for a short time about 1538 and got married, but on the fall of Cromwell and the punishment of Barnes, his friends, he prudently left the country and spent a term of years as pastor of a Lutheran church and as schoolmaster at Bergzabern, in the province of Zweibrücken (Deux Ponts), in Germany. Doubtless during his long sojourn abroad, while translating the Bible, he had learned the languages and made the connections which rendered this arrangement possible. The accession of Edward VI., and the now dominant influence of Cranmer and other reformers, gave Coverdale opportunity to come back to England in 1548.

He was received with marked and deserved favor, and

after filling with acceptance several lower places was made bishop of Exeter in 1551. Of his work in that diocese an old chronicler is quoted as saying: "He most worthilie did performe the office committed unto him; he preached continuallie on everi holie day, and did read most commonly twise in the weeke in some church or other in this citie." On the accession of Mary, Coverdale was put out of his bishopric and a Catholic put in, but through various influences he was allowed to leave England instead of being sent to the stake. Stopping for a while with English friends in Denmark and then in Westphalia, he finally made his way back to his old place at Bergzabern, a second time his refuge.

Once more and lastly this good man of long life and many mutations came back to his native land; this was when the death of Mary ended the persecutions and gave distressed and wasted Protestantism a chance to recover itself under Elizabeth. Coverdale had become more Puritan in his views, and now declined reappointment as bishop, though as titular bishop of Exeter he took part in the consecration of Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury. The rest of his life was devoted to preaching in different places, and he was much sought after. Though not so strong a character as some others of the prominent reformers, and though escaping extreme punishment, Coverdale was never recreant to his principles, and through all his long and troubled life was an eminently good and useful man. The general testimony of his contemporaries represents him as a preacher of more than average popularity and influence.

Useful in the pulpit as were all these men, particularly Rogers and Coverdale, there is a group of reformers whose services and fame lay chiefly in their preaching; and the best known and greatest of these was the eminent bishop and martyr, Hugh Latimer¹ (d. 1555).

About the year 1490, or perhaps even earlier, in the county of Leicester, there was born to a well-to-do yeoman farmer the babe who, in course of stressful years, was to become the most powerful and popular preacher

¹ *Sermons and Remains of Bp. Latimer*, with biographical sketches compiled from Foxe and other sources edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. G. E. Corrie, Cambridge, 1844-5.

of the Reformation in England, and to be in his old age a martyr for the cause he loved. This was Hugh Latimer, an only son, but with several sisters. Do these two facts help to account for that naive and refreshingly inoffensive egotism which we find in his sermons? After education in the schools near his home the wide-awake lad was sent very young to Cambridge, where he resided and studied a number of years as undergraduate, resident graduate and preacher. He took his degrees in the regular course; his conduct at college was irreproachable, and he was highly esteemed by his mates.

At first a very decided papist, he fell under the influence of Thomas Bilney and others, and became converted to the reformed doctrines. Many years later (in 1552), when now an old man, in his first sermon on the Lord's Prayer, he thus recalls the memory of that time: "Here I have occasion to tell you a story which happened at Cambridge. Master Bilney, or, rather, Saint Bilney, that suffered death for God's word sake—the same Bilney was the instrument whereby God called me to knowledge; for I may thank him, next to God, for that knowledge that I have in the Word of God. For I was as obstinate a papist as any was in England, insomuch that when I should be made bachelor of divinity my whole oration went against Philip Melanchthon and against his opinions. Bilney heard me at that time and perceived that I was zealous without knowledge, and he came to me afterwards in my study and desired me for God's sake to hear his confession. I did so; and to say the truth, by his confession I learned more than before in many years. So that from that time forward I began to smell the Word of God and forsook the school doctors and such fooleries." This was the start, but there were other influences that helped, and Latimer was fairly entered on the way of the Reformation.

At what time he was ordained a priest we do not know, but his preaching began at Cambridge, and his talent in that direction was not hid. A hearer of his early sermons at Cambridge said, "None except the stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart went away from his preaching without being affected with high detestation of sin and moved unto all godliness and virtue." His ser-

mons also quickened among his hearers a great desire for reading the Scriptures and for hearing a more evangelical preaching.

This work at the university went on for about two years, but Latimer's zeal and advancing reformatory views awakened opposition. As old Foxe quaintly puts it: "How be it as Satan never sleepeth when he seeth his kingdom begin to decay, so likewise now, seeing that this worthy member of Christ would be a shrewd shaker thereof, he raised up his children to molest and trouble him." So much noise was made that the bishop of Ely, in whose diocese Cambridge lay, determined to hear for himself how Latimer preached, and, without giving notice, came one day, taking pains to arrive after the sermon was begun. Latimer's quick wit, however, was equal to the occasion, and he stopped until the bishop and his retinue were properly seated. Then, remarking that since the bishop had come to hear him, it would be proper to preach what would be appropriate to the occasion, he cleverly changed his text and preached a sermon on the priesthood of Christ as an example to bishops, and unfolded with no less force than tact the high duties of the episcopal office. As his language was respectful and his doctrine scriptural the bishop could take no visible exception to the sermon, but commended it after service as a good exposition of a bishop's duty; but he asked Latimer to agree to preach there soon a sermon in condemnation of the doctrines of Luther. Latimer replied that as Luther's writings had long been prohibited to be read at Cambridge he was not acquainted with his doctrine, but added, "I have preached before you to-day no man's doctrine, but only the doctrine of God out of the Scriptures; and if Luther do none other than I have done there needeth no confutation of his doctrine. Otherwise, when I understand that he doth teach against the Scripture, I will be ready with all my heart to confound his doctrine as much as lieth in me." This answer, rather more shrewd than frank, naturally nettled the bishop, and he replied, "Well, well, Mr. Latimer, I perceive that you somewhat smell of the pan; you will repent this gear one day." The bishop's threat was not idle; for, on further complaint, he forbade Latimer's preaching in any of the

churches belonging to the university. On this Robert Barnes, prior of the Augustinian abbey, and himself strongly inclined to reformed views, opened to Latimer the chapel of that institution, it being not under the bishop's control. So Latimer went on with his preaching, and did not lack a congregation.

Soon, however, complaint was made to Wolsey, and Latimer was called to London to explain himself before the great Cardinal. This he did with such characteristic boldness, combined with tact, that Wolsey not only dismissed the charges, but gave the unproved heretic a general license to preach anywhere in England he would! Latimer was not the man either to keep his victory to himself or slight the opportunities of further preaching thus afforded him.

Meantime the attention of Henry VIII. had been called to Latimer, and he had a curiosity to hear the bold preacher. So Latimer was called to preach before the court, acquitted himself well, was liberally paid for his services, and made so good an impression that in 1530 he was appointed one of the royal chaplains. So that now for a while he had at intervals the dangerous and irksome honor of preaching at the court of Henry VIII. In what spirit he discharged that duty we may gather not only from the character of the man and from the reports of contemporaries, but also from several allusions and reminiscences which are found in his later sermons, when, as an old man, he was court preacher again—this time to Edward VI. One of these passages is as follows: "In the king's days that dead is a many of us were called together before him to say our minds in certain matters. In the end one kneeleth me down and accuseth me of sedition, that I had preached seditious doctrine. An heavy salutation, and a hard point of such a man's doing as if I should name him ye would not think it. The king turned to me and said, 'What say you to that, sir?' Then I kneeled down and turned me first to mine accuser and required him, 'Sir, what form of preaching would you appoint me to preach before a king? Would you have me for to preach nothing as concerning a king in the king's sermon? Have you any commission to appoint me what I shall preach?' Besides this, I asked him divers

other questions, and he would make me no answer to none of them all; he had nothing to say. Then I turned me to the king and submitted myself to his grace and said, 'I never thought myself worthy nor I never sued to be a preacher before your Grace, but I was called to it, and would be willing, if you mislike me, to give place to my betters; for I grant that there be a great many more worthy of the room than I am, and if it be your Grace's pleasure so to allow them for preachers, I could be content to bear their books after them. But if your Grace allow me for a preacher I would desire your Grace to give me leave to discharge my conscience; give me leave to frame my doctrine according to mine audience; I had been a very dolt to have preached so at the borders of your realm as I preach before your Grace.' And I thank Almighty God, which hath always been my remedy, that my sayings were well accepted of the king, for like a gracious lord he turned into another communication." But, though brave and faithful in his perilous position, Latimer wearied of it, he wished to breathe a freer air and speak his mind without being accused of sedition when he framed his doctrine to suit the needs and sins of his audience.

So in 1531, at the request of friends, Latimer was appointed by the king to a benefice at West Kingston, in Wiltshire. In this parish for several years he exercised a diligent and faithful ministry. He carried out his principle of adapting his discourse to his hearers, and preached the very marrow of the gospel in that racy, homely, clear and vigorous style which renders even his reported and printed sermons so charming. His influence extended far beyond his own parish, and he was accused of meddling; but he had his license to preach anywhere he would, and seems to have used his privilege.

Still the opponents of reform and his enemies would give him no rest from attacks and annoyance. The gospel quality of his preaching was the real trouble, but there were not wanting various pretexts for hindering and trying to silence him. Once he was summoned to London, and detained there for several months from his work, confined, and, it seems, for a time, even excommunicated, because he would not subscribe to certain things re-

quired by the bishops in the Catholic interest. But the king finally interfered, and seems to have secured from Latimer some sort of submission or promise to be on his good behavior, and so released him and sent him back to his charge. Latimer still had his share of persecution, and at one time seems to have somewhat compromised his principles, but, if so, it was only a temporary weakness.

Under Cranmer's influence Latimer was once again invited to preach a series of sermons before the king, and in 1535 was made bishop of Worcester. In the following year Cranmer appointed him to preach the sermon before Convocation, and Latimer powerfully attacked in true reformer's style the abuses and corruptions in the church, and more than hinted that the prelates before him had not lived up to their duty in reforming evils. In accordance with custom the sermon was in Latin, but it was translated into English and published, and made a great stir, bringing on the preacher not a little criticism and annoyance; but he went on with his work in his diocese, and was as faithful a bishop as he had been pastor. Latimer's bishopric, however, was not of very long duration; for in 1539, under royal pressure, the famous Six Articles were adopted which reasserted many of the essential Romanist doctrines, including transubstantiation. Latimer could not sign the articles, and resigned his bishopric. For awhile he was placed in custody, but was subsequently released, and for six years was practically lost from view; how he occupied himself being unknown. But his enemies were not satisfied, and in 1547 he was apprehended on some sort of charges and sent to the Tower, where he was confined for the remaining few months of Henry's reign.

On the accession of Edward VI., in 1547, Latimer was promptly released from prison, and in January, 1548, after eight years of silence, he preached again at St. Paul's Cross. On a week day he gave his famous *Sermon on the Plough*,¹ in which he paid his respects to lazy prelates, as well as to some other subjects that needed attention. He was offered again his bishopric at Worcester, but declined, and devoted himself to labors among the people in London and elsewhere, living for the most part with

¹ Fish, *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloq.*, Vol. I., p. 129.

Archbishop Cranmer at Lambeth. He was by no means idle, but preached much in different places. Among the sermons of this period are the notable ones he delivered before the young king on several occasions. Nearly every Sunday he was preaching somewhere, besides doing much other work for the Protestant cause.

When Mary came to the throne, in 1553, Latimer was from the first a marked man. Opportunity was given him to escape from England, but he declined to leave, and in September, 1553, he was again confined in the Tower. Along with Cranmer and Ridley he was later taken to Oxford for trial, and was imprisoned there for two years, till in September, 1555, a new trial was ordered and he and Ridley were condemned to the stake. The execution took place on the 16th of October, and is thus described by one of the old chroniclers: "When Master Latimer stood at the stake and the tormentors were about to set fire upon him and that most reverend father Doctor Ridley, he lifted up his eyes to heaven with a most amiable and comfortable countenance, saying these words: 'God is faithful who does not suffer us to be tempted above our strength.' And, addressing himself to Master Ridley, he said, 'Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England as I trust shall never be put out.'"

As a preacher Latimer ranks among the best of his time. The contemporary accounts of his preaching bear most emphatic testimony to its charm, its power, and its practical results. And though he spoke freely, without written preparation, we are fortunate in having excellent reports of a large number of his sermons by the hand of Augustine Bernher, a Swiss, who for some years served Latimer faithfully and affectionately as a secretary and helper. These published sermons confirm the traditions of Latimer's excellence as a preacher. They bear in many traits, both of thought and style, the stamp of a marked individuality. Courage combined with shrewdness and tact, strong convictions and deep feeling joined to a lively wit and quaint humor, clear and firm grasp of truth along with an easy familiarity of manner, indifference to exact analysis and division, yet an orderly presentation and vigorous movement of thought, are some

of the things that show themselves to the reader of his sermons. They do not deal so much in exposition as in application of Scripture, but they exalt the authority and reverence the truth of God's Word. "His utterances are as fresh as morning air, or the morning song of the birds. He grasps truth with vigor, handles it with ease, holds it up before you with startling reality."¹ And, it may be added, he fortified his doctrine by his life.

Latimer's companion in martyrdom, Nicholas Ridley (d. 1555) came of an ancient and respected family in Northumberland, where he was born about the beginning of the sixteenth century. He had an uncle, Robert, who was an influential priest and preacher, and never left the Catholic faith. Nicholas was educated at Cambridge and made a fine reputation as a scholar, especially distinguishing himself in Greek. He later pursued his studies at the Sorbonne in Paris, and at the university of Louvain. Not till after the death of his uncle Robert, and then only gradually, did Ridley become a convert to the Protestant faith. He discussed the living questions much with Peter Martyr Vermigli and with Cranmer, the latter of whom leaned much through life on Ridley's learning and judgment. In the latter part of King Henry's reign Ridley was advanced to a good many church honors, was a royal chaplain, a canon of Canterbury, and also of Westminster. During this time he was preaching much, and his reformed opinions were growing and strengthening into vital convictions. During the reign of King Edward his conversion to Protestantism became complete, further honors came to him, and his preaching and writing were a powerful advocacy of the Reformation. He was first made bishop of Rochester and in 1550 promoted to the see of London, instead of Bonner. Ridley showed great consideration to the deposed prelate's mother and sister, whom he permitted still to live in the episcopal residence. He was a staunch friend and patron of Rogers and Bradford, whose preaching gifts he recognized and used by appointing them to places of influence. He was also in close touch with Cranmer and with Hooper, though Hooper's pronounced puritanism and objections to vestments, and other details of remnants from Cath-

¹ Broadus *Hist. Prea.*, p. 192.

olicism, involved the two men in disagreeable controversies. In 1553 Ridley preached before the young king a sermon in behalf of the London poor, and so effective was the plea that Edward sought an interview with the preacher, and the outcome was the establishment of three hospitals in the city. In his court preaching he did not spare the men who, taking advantage of the king's youth and ill-health, were guilty of shameless greed and corruptions.

On the death of Edward VI. Ridley was induced by the Earl of Northumberland to declare in favor of Lady Jane Grey, and in a sermon at Paul's Cross before the Mayor and Corporation of London, on the Sunday after the young king died, the bishop took strong ground against the legitimacy of both Mary and Elizabeth, and denounced in vigorous terms Mary's Romanism as a menace to England. The speedy collapse of Lady Jane Grey's little reign and the proclamation of Mary as queen were, of course, fatal to Ridley. He threw himself on the queen's mercy—a pitiful refuge truly!—but could not renounce his convictions. He was promptly committed to the Tower, then sent with Cranmer and Latimer, as we have seen, to Oxford. During his long imprisonment he wrote letters and some able treatises in defence of the Protestant faith, and toward the last gave out two farewell addresses, full of courage and eloquence, exhorting his brethren to steadfastness and trust. In company with Latimer—the two encouraging each other—and with Cranmer from the prison window sadly looking on, he was burned at the stake October 16, 1555.

Ridley was a profound scholar and an able theologian, perhaps the strongest in this early group of reformers. Parker and Jewel among the latter ones were probably his equals in learning, but his position among the leaders of his own time is indicated in the remark of Bonner or Gardiner: ¹ “Latimer leaneth to Cranmer, Cranmer leaneth to Ridley, and Ridley leaneth to his own singular wit.” As to his preaching, Foxe ² says: “Every holiday and Sunday he preached in some place or other, unless hindered by weighty business. The people resorted to his sermons, swarming about him like bees, and coveting the

¹ Beckett, p. 210.

² Id., p. 211.

sweet flowers and wholesome juice of the fruitful doctrine which he did not only preach, but showed the same by his life." The literary remains from Ridley are disappointingly little, though of excellent quality.¹ He either did not care to publish or did not take time, and there was no one to report and hand down his sermons as Latimer's friend did. The treatise on the Lord's Supper is an able and clear presentation of the Protestant criticism of transubstantiation, and defends the Swiss, rather Calvin's than Zwingli's, view of the ordinance. The *Lamentation for the Change in Religion*, like the former treatise given out from his prison, deplores the bringing in again of Romanism under Mary, and is a weighty defence of the Reformation. The two farewell addresses already mentioned abound in Scripture quotations, breathe a noble courage and trust, glow with love, and are couched in the lofty eloquence of a great soul that was looking death in the face and was not afraid.

After Ridley and Latimer should be named their fellow-laborer and fellow-sufferer, John Hooper (d. 1555), who was martyred in the same year, but some eight months before they were. Hooper came of a well-to-do family in Somerset, where he was born toward the end of the fifteenth century. He was educated at Oxford, and is said to have entered the Cistercian monastery at Gloucester when he was ordained a priest. On the suppression of the monastery he went to London, where he seems to have lived about the court in rather a worldly way for a time. Getting hold of the writings of Zwingli and Bullinger, he became impressed with their views and went back to Oxford with the intention of teaching his new opinions there. But he attracted the notice of the sharp Catholic professor, Richard Smith, who was about to try him for heresy when he left Oxford and became steward for Sir Thomas Arundel. He, as a good Catholic, was much concerned because of Hooper's heresies, and sent him to have a conference with the famous Bishop Gardiner, in hope of curing him. Instead of that the effect of the discussion was but to confirm Hooper in his views. To avoid trial Hooper now left England and spent some time abroad, then came back, then went

¹ *Life and Writings of Bp. Ridley*, Rel. Tract. Soc.

away again, this time to Switzerland. At Strasburg he met with Butzer, and at Zürich with Bullinger.

In 1549, on the establishment of Protestantism, he returned to England, and was at once recognized as a leader among the reformers. He was appointed chaplain to the Protector, the Duke of Somerset, and had frequent opportunities for preaching in London. This he did almost daily, and his sermons attracted crowded congregations. He sympathized with the Swiss theologians, was not much in favor of episcopacy, and decidedly opposed to the use of clerical vestments and other matters of ceremonial retained from the old church. In fact he was of the tendency of thought that under Elizabeth and the Stuarts came to be stigmatized as Puritan. This involved him in controversies with Cranmer and Ridley, who did not agree with these views; but Hooper was very highly esteemed by the young king, who admired his preaching. In a series of sermons before the king on the prophet Jonah he attacked some of the Romish practices that were allowed to remain in the Church of England; but, notwithstanding his Puritan views and his combativeness, Hooper was nominated to the bishopric of Gloucester and urged by the king and others to accept. He had many scruples on matters of detail, such as the form of the oath, the vestments and so on, but finally, some compromises being made on both sides, he yielded and was made bishop of Gloucester in 1550.

As bishop Hooper was devoted and active not only in affairs of administration, but especially in introducing reforms and in preaching. In respect to the last his anxious wife wrote to their good friend Bullinger at Zürich that he should "recommend Master Hooper to be more moderate in his labor, for he preaches four or at least three times every day, and I am afraid lest these over-abundant exertions should cause a premature decay." ¹

Later the diocese of Gloucester was merged into that of Worcester, and Hooper was called by the latter title. He was not so successful in introducing reforms at Worcester as at Gloucester, but worked hard and made earnest friends and stout opponents at both places. He

¹ Beckett, p. 209.

was a man of much gravity, not to say severity, of temper and manner, not so genial as Latimer nor so gentle as Ridley. He once rebuked for his vices a man of high social standing, and so severely that he was assaulted for it; but later, when Hooper was in jail and expecting to be executed, this gentleman came to see him, apologized for the assault, thanked the bishop for helping him mend his life, and urged him to escape martyrdom by recanting.

Though somewhat austere, Hooper was a good and true man, kind and liberal to the poor, upright and devoted in his office, and he made many friends in Gloucester. He was opposed to the claims of Lady Jane Grey and favored on legal grounds the accession of Mary; but this did not save him from arrest and trial for heresy; he had been much too active and successful to escape that. He was imprisoned, examined, condemned, and sent to Gloucester to be burned at the stake that his martyrdom might strike terror to his followers there. In view of his popularity, he was forbidden to speak to the people. His execution was awkwardly managed and his sufferings intense, but he bore them heroically. His martyrdom occurred in February, 1555, a short time after that of Rogers.

Not so famous or so highly placed as the three last mentioned, but scarcely inferior to any of them—unless it was Latimer—in preaching power, was the pious and eloquent John Bradford¹ (d. 1555). He was a native of Manchester, received a good school education and showed decided aptitude for business. This talent got him a position with Sir John Harrington, treasurer and paymaster of the English forces in France. There were some frauds in this office, and Bradford resigned. While probably not deeply involved in the irregularities, he seems to have felt somewhat responsible, and under Latimer's preaching in London he was moved, at great personal sacrifice, to make restitution of a large amount of conscience money to the royal treasury. He engaged in the study of law in London, but soon his mind and heart turned toward preaching, though with hesitation and self-distrust, and he went to Cambridge to study.

¹ *Writings of John Bradford*, Rel. Tract Soc.

This was in King Edward's time, while Martin Butzer was professor of theology there. Bradford's zeal in study, his amiable character and unaffected piety won general esteem. Butzer urged him to begin preaching, but Bradford hesitated and feared, and Butzer said to him, "If thou have not fine manchet bread then give the poor people barley bread." Soon he was ordained a deacon by Ridley at London, and then priest. Ridley saw his value and appointed him a prebendary (salaried preacher) at St. Paul's. Besides the duties of this office there were frequent occasions for his preaching at other places, and he was one of the six preachers appointed under Edward VI. as a sort of itinerant ministry, or general evangelists, in all parts of the kingdom. Thus the three years of Bradford's work as a preacher were abundant in labors. Foxe is quoted as speaking of his work in these terms: "Sharply he opened and reproved sin, sweetly he preached Christ crucified, pithily he impugned heresies and errors, earnestly he persuaded to godly life."

He was a man of deep piety and was often engaged in penitential meditations and in prayer. One of his sayings, sometimes attributed to Bunyan and others, is often quoted. When he saw a criminal on the way to execution he remarked, "But for the grace of God there goes John Bradford." His zeal and success aroused the opposition of the Catholics, and soon after Mary's accession to the throne occasion was sought and found to have him tried and condemned. A certain Catholic preacher—Bradford and Rogers being present—took occasion at St. Paul's Cross to speak disparagingly of the late King Edward and in the highest terms of the bigoted Bishop Bonner. This so enraged the crowd that they were about to mob the preacher, and he appealed to Bradford for protection. Bradford reproved the crowd for their disorder, and he and Rogers, at some risk, protected the man from violence. But the affair was perverted, and it was made to appear that Bradford had really stirred up the people to disorder. So he was arrested and sent to the Tower along with Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer. At one time the four were confined in one room and they employed their time in Bible study and mutual help.

Bradford's imprisonment was long, but honorable to

him. He worked for God among his fellow-prisoners of every sort, endeavoring to lead them to Christ and comfort them in Christ. So trustworthy was he that one of his keepers allowed him sometimes to leave the prison in order to visit the sick and needy outside, and Bradford always returned punctually at the hour appointed, or even before. Nor was this all the good man did, but from his prison he wrote many letters to friends outside, encouraging them to hold on to their Protestant faith amid the trying years, and thus he worked for his convictions by his pen when he could no longer preach. These letters were widely circulated, and had a great influence. Even after his condemnation, in January, 1555, Bradford remained many months in prison, but was at last brought to the stake in June of that year. Fuller, describing his death, says, "He endured the flame as a fresh gale of wind in a hot summer's day, without any reluctancy; confirming by his death the truth of that doctrine which he had so diligently and powerfully preached during his life."

Of Bradford's preaching several valuable specimens remain, and they confirm fully the contemporary accounts of his excellent gifts. His letters and a few treatises set forth in clear thinking, plain style and with warmth the fundamental doctrines and principles of the Reformation; and there are two notable sermons. One of these is rather polemical in tone, being on the Lord's Supper, and attacking the Catholic doctrines, but it, as well as the other, breathes the spirit of the gospel. Bradford is less expository than the Germans, less general and gossipy than Latimer, and at the same time less powerful and fresh. But his grasp of Scripture is accurate and firm, and his manner of presenting the truth, both in arrangement and language, is singularly clear, fervent and winning. During one of his evangelizing tours, early in 1553, Bradford preached a notable sermon on repentance, which he was induced afterwards to write out, and it was published only a short time before the death of the young king. In the preface he tells how he came to publish it. After speaking of the great need of repentance among all classes, he says: "This to the end that for my part I might help, I have now put forth this Sermon on

Repentance, which has lain by me half a year at least as to the most part of it. For the last winter I was abroad preaching in the country, my chance was to make a sermon on repentance, which was earnestly by divers desired of me that I should give it to them written, or else put it forth in print. I, for the satisfying of my promise and profiting of the simple, ignorant and rude, have now caused this sermon to be printed; which I beseech God, for his Christ's sake, to use as a mean whereby of his mercy it may please him to work in me and many others hearty repentance for our sins to the glory of his name. Thus fare thou well in the Lord. This 12th day of July, 1553." It is difficult to speak in too high terms of the sermon itself; for it is the very meat and marrow of the gospel, simply and clearly divided and arranged, put in vigorous, plain yet dignified and noble style, with many felicities of thought and phrase, and charged through and through with the spirit of piety, earnestness and devotion. The text is our Lord's proclamation in Matt. 4:17, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The introduction is natural and simple, the explanation of the text is correct. He makes repentance to consist of three elements: a genuine sorrow in view of sin, some persuasion or hope of God's willingness to pardon sin for Christ's sake, and a purpose to amend and turn to God, though the actual conversion is rather a fruit of repentance than repentance itself. On this plan his discourse proceeds, with appropriate subdivisions, in which he holds up the motives to sorrow for sin, the tokens of God's willingness to forgive, and the results of a true purpose to amend. In dwelling on God's willingness to forgive, he adduces the death of Christ as the supreme token of the divine mercy in these words: "This death of Christ therefore look on as the very pledge of God's love towards thee, whosoever thou art, how deeply soever thou hast sinned. See, God's hands are nailed, they cannot strike thee; his feet also, he cannot run from thee; his arms are wide open to embrace thee; his head hangs down to kiss thee; his very heart is open, so that therein see, look, spy, behold, and thou shalt see nothing therein but love, love, love to thee. Hide thee, therefore; lay thy head there with the evangel-

ist." The careful reader of this sermon will not wonder at Ridley's emphatic testimony of Bradford: "He was a man by whom God hath and doth work wonders in setting forth his word."

Among the group of England's greatest preachers at this time must be mentioned the famous Scotch reformer, John Knox. His life and work belong principally, of course, to Scotland, and will be treated more fully later; but he spent, during Edward's reign, five fruitful years in England, and left an influence behind him that endured for generations. There is no doubt that the powerful Puritan sentiment in the Church of England was largely due to Knox as well as to Hooper and others.¹ On his release from the French galleys, most likely at King Edward's intervention, Knox came to England in 1549, and was appointed preacher first at Berwick, where he attracted large congregations and introduced reforms. His activity brought him into conflict with Tunstall, bishop of Durham, but Knox had the best of the controversy, and was let alone. Later he was assigned to Newcastle as preacher, was appointed a royal chaplain, and offered the bishopric of Rochester. More resolute than Hooper, he declined the office, for he could not accept episcopacy and other Anglican arrangements as scriptural. When called before the Council to confer on the matter he was told that they were "sorry he was of a contrary mind to the common order," and he replied that he was even more sorry that "the common order" was contrary to the institution of Christ. When it came his turn to preach as royal chaplain before the court, on one occasion he was bold to daring in denouncing the notorious corruptions of some of the high officials about the young king. He is reported to have said,² "What wonder is it that a young and innocent king be deceived by crafty, covetous, wicked and ungodly councillors? I am greatly afraid that Ahithopel is councillor, that Judas bears the purse, and that Shebna is scribe, controller and treasurer." Yet afterwards the preacher reproached himself that he had not been a "true soldier" nor "so fervent in rebuking manifest iniquity" as he ought to have been!

¹ See Prof. Lorimer's book on *Knox in England*, referred to by Broadus, *Hist. Prea.*, p. 194.

² Beckett, p. 213.

Worthy of mention here was another Scotchman who, after a period of activity in his own country, came to England in 1547. This was John Rough (d. 1557), who had acquired a fair education in Scotland, had also done some effective work as a preacher of reform doctrines, but, escaping to England before the fall of St. Andrews, received appointment as preacher at Carlisle, and later at Berwick, Newcastle and Hull. He did efficient service at all these places till Mary's accession drove him out of England, and he retired to Friesland, where he and his wife supported themselves by knitting garments. He ventured to London on business where he was induced to become pastor of a secret Protestant church. The congregation was betrayed by one of its own members and Rough was captured, tried before Bonner, and sent to the stake in December, 1557. No sermons of his remain, but Knox and others bear emphatic testimony to the power of his preaching.

A very useful man in Edward's days, and still more so in the early years of Elizabeth, was Thomas Lever (1521-1577), who was born in Lancashire, educated at Cambridge and then converted to Protestantism. In February, 1550, he preached with great acceptance at the Shrouds, in St. Paul's churchyard, London, and was invited to preach before the king in the following Lent. In December of that same year he did some notable preaching at St. Paul's Cross, and powerfully denounced existing evils. Some later sermons before the king called forth warm approval from Knox and others. During the days of persecution under Mary he was in Europe in touch with the exiles and other reformers, but returned at Elizabeth's accession and was busily engaged in preaching to the end of his useful life. He was Puritan in his convictions and did not escape controversy and trials in his dealings with the leaders of the Anglican party. It is said of him: ¹ "Preaching was his talent. His sermons resembled Latimer's in their bluntness and boldness, and his reputation was made by his sharp rebukes of the courtiers when preaching before Edward VI."

One of the most attractive and interesting figures among the English Reformation preachers is that of

¹ Article in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

Bernard Gilpin (1517-1583), who was called the "Apostle of the North." He came of excellent family in Westmoreland, was a nephew of the celebrated bishop Tunstall, and had other high connections. He was educated at Oxford, was a fine student, and only very slowly came to Protestant views. When he was ordained a priest in 1549 he scrupled at the oath which recognized the king's supremacy, and only accepted it with a condition; and he disputed ably with Hooper in defence of the Catholic faith. Later he was set to dispute with Peter Martyr Vermigli, then professor at Oxford, but his studies in preparation for this proposed contest upset his mind as to some of the Romanist positions. This was the entering wedge, and gradually he became satisfied of the soundness of the reform views. His uncle Tunstall tried to help him, appointed him to various positions in his diocese of Durham and would not suffer him to be molested, even though Gilpin advanced rapidly in Protestant views and preached them boldly. But even Tunstall's influence could not always shield the outspoken preacher from the relentless Catholics of Mary's time, and in the last year of her reign Gilpin was summoned to London to answer for his heresies. On the way he had a fall and broke his leg, and his prosecution fell through, the queen having died before he got well.

Gilpin was strongly Puritan in his leanings, so that he declined a bishopric and also a professorship at Oxford, because he was not satisfied with the remains of "popery" left in the Anglican settlement under Elizabeth and her prelates. With some trials and controversies growing out of these differences he continued his useful ministry to the end of his life. One only sermon remains from him, but his reputation as a preacher and pastor was very great among his contemporaries, not only for learning, piety and eloquence, but for unusual graces of character.

The last of the Reformation preachers in England to be noticed is that group of distinguished prelates who in the early years of Queen Elizabeth settled the Anglican church system in the forms which have continued to be characteristic of it. None among them had commanding pulpit gifts, but a few at least of the well-known leaders cannot be omitted in a history of preaching.

The scholarly and able archbishop of Canterbury,

Matthew Parker (1504-1575) was noted rather as the wise and conciliatory prelate who successfully guided the Anglican establishment between the Romanist tendencies of the queen and others on the one side, and the extreme Puritanism of the more radical Protestants on the other. Among his numerous writings no sermons are mentioned. The slight merit of the authorship of the homily on Matrimony in the sensible but sapless second *Book of Homilies* is deemed to be his; but concerning his earlier years it is said that "to his acquirements as a theologian he united a popular style of pulpit oratory which induced Cranmer in 1533 to license him to preach throughout the southern province." But the fame of Parker is that of an educator, scholar and prelate rather than preacher.

More of a preacher but less of a prelate than Parker was his successor in the see of Canterbury, Edmund Grindal (d. 1583), who in his earlier years had been recognized as a preacher of no little ability, and had held pulpits of prominence in Edward's time under Ridley, bishop of London. Like so many others an exile in Mary's reign, he returned under Elizabeth to take up the heavy work of restoring wasted Protestantism in England. He was far more Puritan than Parker, nevertheless accepted the bishopric of London and gave Parker and the queen, no less than himself, considerable trouble in his scruples as to many of the proposed Anglican institutions. To get him out of the way he was appointed to the archbishopric of York, and on Parker's death—because for the moment it suited the queen's shifting policy,—he was made archbishop of Canterbury. As he was a peace-loving man and not wholly in accord with the drift of things, his bishoprics were a continual trial to him, and he doubtless would have been happier, and more useful too, had he remained simply a preacher in some place suitable to his learning and talents. A memorial discourse on the death of the emperor Ferdinand, and the fourth homily in the *Second Book*, on Good Works, especially Fasting, seem to be all of his sermons that survive, and these would not make a man famous. The homily, however, presents clearly the Protestant doctrine as to good works and treats the matter of fasting with good sense and clearness.

The successor of Grindal as archbishop of York, Edwin Sandys (d. 1588), was like that prelate in his ecclesiastical principles, but very unlike him in character. He was educated at Cambridge, and was a friend of Martin Butzer while that theologian was professor there. On Edward's death he supported Lady Jane Grey and preached a sermon upholding her cause which is said to have "pulled many tears out of the eyes of the biggest of them," presumably the leading men of the time. Naturally he was arrested by Mary's partisans and put into the Tower, but through somebody's favor he managed to get away to the Continent, where he remained till Elizabeth's accession. He also was more Puritan than Parker, and his views on church polity and some other questions kept him in continual controversies. But his abilities and staunch Protestantism made him too useful to be overlooked in restoring the cause, and he was first made bishop of Worcester, and then, on Grindal's promotion to Canterbury, archbishop of York. During these years something is said of his preaching, and a good deal of his quarrels. Some of his sermons were printed in 1585 and reprinted in several later editions. They are not held to be of very great value.

The best preacher among these Elizabethan prelates was John Jewel (d. 1571), bishop of Salisbury.¹ Born in Devonshire in 1522, he was educated at several preliminary schools and studied in two colleges at Oxford. Here one of his fruitful tasks was the making of a critical comparison between the Bible versions of Tindale and Coverdale. Jewel was a laborious student, and worked so hard as permanently to injure his health. On getting his degree he was appointed to lecture for a while on Latin and Rhetoric, and his lectures were well attended. In 1547 Peter Martyr Vermigli came as professor to Oxford, and during his work there he exercised a profound influence upon Jewel. When and where Jewel was ordained is not known, but he appears as a licensed preacher in 1551, became vicar at a small village near

¹ *Works of Bishop Jewel*, with Featley's abridgment of Humphrey's *Life* prefixed, printed at London in 1640; art. in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, etc. The famous "Challenge Sermon" is reprinted in *Fish, Masterpieces*, etc., Vol. I., p. 146 ff.

Oxford, and got his degree of Bachelor of Divinity in 1552, preaching on the occasion an excellent discourse in Latin, of which we shall see more later. On the accession of Mary, Jewel was deprived of his places, and, though he sacrificed his convictions and signed certain articles, he was still suspected and found it necessary to leave England. At Frankfort, where were Knox and a number of English exiles, Jewel was coldly received till he made public acknowledgment of his weakness and error in recanting, and reaffirmed his real views. Later he was with his friend Vermigli at Strasburg and Zürich.

In 1559 Jewel gladly returned to England, and became active in helping to restore the Protestant cause. At first strongly inclined to Puritanism, he quickly acquiesced in the Anglican compromises, and became one of the clearest and strongest expounders and defenders of the English church system. Like others, he soon saw that, with the temper of the queen and of a large element of the people, it would be impossible to establish either the Puritan extreme or its opposite. In doctrine, however, he always held with the Reformed confessions and wrote to Vermigli, "As to matters of doctrine, we do not differ from you by a nail's breadth." He displayed much activity in preaching and other work about London. In a sermon at St. Paul's Cross in 1559 he made his famous challenge to the papists, and it was repeated in a sermon delivered before the court in March, 1560, and again at St. Paul's Cross later in the same month. The challenge was to the effect that if any one could prove the essential Romanist doctrines as to the papacy, purgatory, masses, transubstantiation, and so on, by Scripture or by any church teacher for six hundred years after Christ, he, Jewel, would subscribe to it and renounce Protestantism. These sermons were not written before delivery, but the last of them was soon written out and published—"shortly set forth as near as the author could call it to remembrance, without any alteration or addition." The challenge was taken up by two Catholics, and Jewel was led into a controversy which went on for some time.

In 1560, while this debate was on, Jewel was made bishop of Salisbury, and went to his diocese. He found much to do, and was very diligent, not only in visiting and

administration, but in preaching, because of the great dearth of preachers. In April, 1561, he filled another preaching engagement at St. Paul's Cross, and in the following year appeared his great and famous *Apology for the Church of England*. This was the first elaborate statement of the Anglican position in a work of first-rate importance, and it was immediately accepted as a clear and powerful exposition of that view. It remains one of the classic treatises of the Anglican ecclesiology. The *Apology* provoked a fresh attack from the Catholics. What with these writings and controversies, the cares of the diocese, activity in the general work of the church, and assiduous preaching, Jewel's never very strong health gave way. In 1571 he came home from Parliament much exhausted, but immediately undertook a visitation of his diocese. To the remonstrance of a friend he answered, "A bishop had best die preaching," and it was not long before the end came, in September, 1571.

In Daniel Featley's abridgment of Dr. Humphrey's life of Jewel, prefixed to an early edition of his works, occurs a quaint but striking eulogy, a part of which runs thus: "And surely, if ever to any, then unto him his bishoprike was a continuall worke of ruling and governing, not only by the pastorall staffe of his jurisdiction in his consistory, but also in the court of men's consciences by the golden sceptre of God's word preached. The memorie of his assiduitie in preaching, carefulnesse in providing pastours, resolutenesse in reforming abuses, bountie in relieving the poore, wisdom in composing litigious strifes, equitie in judging spirituall causes, faithfulness in keeping and sinceritie in bestowing church goods, is as an ointment powred out and blowen abroad thorow the diocesse of Sarum by the breath of everie man's commendation."

Jewel was a sound scholar, with a clear head and a good memory, logical and correct. His writings show the confidence of one who is conscious of accurate learning. His sermons lack warmth, but not conviction; fervor, but not strength; imagination and passion, but not logic and clearness. The Latin sermon delivered at Oxford for his degree in divinity, and done into English by Dr. Humphrey, expresses with force his own views of

the preaching office, early formed, but never abandoned. From the text, 1 Peter 4:11, "If any man speak let him talk as the words of God," he deduces the simple theme and division: (1) That the preacher should preach; (2) What he should preach; (3) How he should preach. In urging the importance of preaching, he says: "It is not enough to know I wot not what learning. The devils, perhaps, know more than any of us all. It belongeth unto a pastor not so much to have learned many things as to have taught much." Speaking of people's unwillingness to hear as an incentive rather than a discouragement to diligence, he says, "Let us bring forth the light, and God will open their eyes; let us beat at their ears, and God will give them a heart of flesh; let us give the word, and God will give the Spirit; let us plant and water, and God in due time will give the increase." The famous challenge sermon is naturally rather polemical in tone, and is somewhat overloaded with learned quotation, but it is logical and vigorous and not devoid of occasional passages of feeling and power. In general Jewel's sermons lack the breeziness of Latimer's and the devout glow of Bradford's, but they are strong, clear and sensible presentations of the doctrines and principles dear to all the reformers.

3. THE SCOTCH REFORMATION

The religious situation in Scotland before the Reformation was dark and deplorable in the extreme. A turbulent and violent nobility; a wealthy, luxurious, corrupt and rapacious clergy; a people sunken in ignorance and superstition; these are the sombre outlines of a picture whose details may be left to the imagination. Yet some beginnings of better things were made early in the sixteenth century. Some influences of the revival of learning had entered the schools, and the writings of Luther and other reformers, though forbidden, were not wholly unknown. By the time Knox began his early reformatory work, in 1542, the principles of the Reformation had made considerable progress, not only among the common people, but also among the nobility and gentry, and there were not a few who were ready to fight and die, if need be, for the faith.

4. PREDECESSORS OF KNOX

Besides the influence of teachers, of Reformation literature, of private conference, there were a few preachers¹ before Knox who dared, at great peril from the dominant Romanist clergy, with Beaton at their head, to lift up their voices in favor of reform. Among these three are deserving of special mention.

Patrick Hamilton (c. 1504-1528), the young and noble martyr for the truth, came of a family of rank and distinction, and was born near Glasgow, probably in 1504. He was designed for the priesthood, and after receiving preliminary education in the schools he went to Paris—where he got his master's degree in 1520—and probably to Louvain also. Returning to Scotland, he studied a while at St. Andrews. About 1525 he began to show decided sympathy for the reformed views and to teach them. Falling under suspicion, and being in danger of prosecution, he retired from Scotland and went to Germany, where, at Wittenberg, he studied with Luther and Melancthon; and at Marburg with the French exile and professor, François Lambert. But the state of his own country bore on his mind and gave him no rest, so that, against the earnest remonstrance of Lambert, he determined to return to Scotland and do what he could to introduce the Reformation. He came back in 1527, married, and began to preach the Protestant doctrines. It is not certain that he had ever been ordained a priest, at any rate, he held no clerical charge, and his preaching was, therefore, irregular, and that fact, as well as his doctrine and his zeal, aroused speedy and fatal opposition. He was summoned before Archbishop Beaton at St. Andrews to answer charges of heresy. He foresaw his fate, but bravely went to meet it. With show of consideration he was granted time to consider and recant, but used his respite instead to proclaim his doctrines as much as he could. He was condemned and executed as a heretic in 1528. His youth, rank, earnestness, and sad death created profound impressions, led many to investigate the

¹ McCrie's *Life of Knox*; Brown's *Life of Knox*; notices by Blaikie in his *Preachers of Scotland*, and by Taylor in his *Scottish Pulpit*.

causes of his condemnation, and thus resulted in furthering rather than suppressing the progress of the new views. His eloquence and zeal gave promise of a noble career as preacher had he been spared to pursue his reforming course.

Another preacher and martyr was George Wishart (d. 1546), who died for his convictions nearly twenty years after Hamilton; having suffered under the second Archbishop Beaton, who was also a cardinal. Wishart came of a family near Montrose, but details as to his early life are wanting. There are traditions and traces of his education and of his good knowledge of Greek—unusual among his countrymen then. About 1538 he, or a person of similar name, appears in certain records in England as under trial for heresy; and about this time it seems that he studied for a while in Germany. Later, in Scotland, he translated the Helvetic Confession and spread it abroad. In 1543 he is found, living in great simplicity and piety, and studying very hard, at Cambridge, in England. The next year he returned to Scotland and took up his reformatory ministry in earnest.

The younger Beaton, the cardinal, was now at the head of the Catholics in Scotland, and was as relentless as his uncle had been in persecution of the reformers. Wishart was to go the way of Hamilton, but he went his course with courage and devotion. A part of McCrie's brief but eloquent account of Wishart in his *Life of Knox*¹ may be better transcribed than condensed: "Seldom do we meet in ecclesiastical history with a character so amiable and interesting as that of George Wishart. Excelling all his countrymen at that period in learning, of the most persuasive eloquence, irreproachable life, courteous and affable in manners, his fervent piety, zeal and courage in the cause of truth were tempered with uncommon meekness, modesty, patience, prudence and charity. In his tour of preaching through Scotland he was usually accompanied by some of the principal gentry; and the people, who flocked to hear him, were ravished with his discourses."

He had a great influence over Knox, who often accompanied him in his preaching journeys. When Wishart

¹ P. 21.

was arrested to be taken before Cardinal Beaton for trial Knox wished to go with him, but Wishart said, "Nay, return to your bairns [his pupils]; ane is sufficient for a sacrifice." Thus he clearly foresaw what was coming. And so, early in 1546, this preacher also suffered at the stake; but left a name and work behind him. His death was speedily and terribly avenged. A strong party, composed of those who had various and sore grievances against the harsh and tyrannous cardinal, captured the castle of St. Andrews and put the cruel prelate to death. Though this murder was occasioned largely by other things than religious animosities, there is probably no doubt that many of the reformers were in sympathy with the conspirators. Even Knox, though he seems not to have been chargeable with any direct share in it, afterwards sought in some degree to justify the act as the deserved execution of one who could not be reached by the processes of law. The conspirators retained possession of the castle of St. Andrews and became the nucleus of the Reformed party in Scotland.

Mention has already been made of the ministry and fate of John Rough (d. 1557) in England, but his earlier work in Scotland claims brief notice here. Far less cultured than Hamilton, Wishart or Knox, Rough had a glowing zeal for the cause of reform and a ready popular eloquence that acquired for him great reputation as a preacher. He had been a monk, but on the Earl of Arran's request had been released from the cloister and made a chaplain to that nobleman. When Arran relinquished the reformed faith and became regent, Rough retired for a while; but after the murder of Cardinal Beaton, and upon invitation of the conspirators, now in possession of St. Andrews, he became a minister to the congregation there. When Knox came to St. Andrews Rough urgently pressed upon him the duty of preaching, as we shall see, but shortly afterwards went to England, where his work has already been described.

5. JOHN KNOX AND HIS WORK

As is well known, the preëminent name among the preachers of the Reformation in Scotland is that of John

Knox ¹ (1505-1572). Not so original or great as Luther, Zwingli or Calvin, he yet occupies toward the establishment of Protestantism in his own country a position similar to theirs relative to the movements associated with their names.

John Knox was born in the county of East Lothian, near Haddington, of respectable parents of the middle class, in the year 1505. His father had means enough to give the boy a good education, and after preparatory schooling he entered Glasgow University, where he studied under John Major, and formed a lasting friendship with the gifted George Buchanan, poet and man of letters.

About 1530 Knox was ordained a priest, but soon afterward began to study the Fathers, with the effect that Jerome led him to the Scriptures and Augustine to a more evangelical theology. Knox lectured at Glasgow and also at St. Andrews, and at the latter place he not only began to teach a better theology, but to denounce corruptions in the church. By the year 1542 he had become fully committed to the reformed faith.

Beaton's attention being directed to Knox, he found it prudent to leave St. Andrews, and soon after found a place of protection as tutor in the family of Hugh Douglas of Langniddrie, a nobleman who sympathized with the reformed views. The son of another gentleman, John Cockburn of Ormiston, was also placed under his care; and Knox's distinctive work as a reformer may now be said in this modest way to have begun. For he not only taught his pupils the rudiments of learning, but the tenets of the gospel; and others besides his scholars were admitted at times to his Bible lectures and catechism. These more public instructions were given in a chapel on his patron's estate. This went on for several years, and Knox attached himself with ardor to Wishart on some of that preacher's expeditions.

After the assassination of Beaton, his successor, Hamilton, pursued the reformers with unremitting vigor, and Knox was seriously thinking of leaving the country. But

¹ The works of McCrie, Brown, Lorimer, and others previously referred to, Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, and numerous other sources.

his friends and patrons were loath to lose his services as a teacher, and persuaded him to go with his pupils to the congregation of the reformers, who were maintaining themselves still at the castle of St. Andrews. Rough, as we have seen, was already installed there as minister, and he welcomed Knox as an able recruit. Knox continued the kind of instructions he had been giving at Langniddrie, and his expositions of the Scripture and power of speech immediately attracted attention. The result was that, by the unanimous vote of the congregation, and at Rough's solemn and earnest request, Knox was also called as a preacher to the reformers at St. Andrews. It was altogether an interesting, not to say anomalous, situation. Here was an unorganized assembly of reformers, not formally out of the old church, gathered about a nucleus of armed men, who had upon them the guilt of Beaton's assassination, and were maintaining themselves by force against the government; and they had called as their preachers an ex-monk, John Rough, and an ex-priest, John Knox! But irregularities were not of much weight to men who felt sure of the truth they held, and believed they were doing God's will. This first ministry of Knox was powerful, but brief. Rough saw how the matter must end, and retired to England; but Knox held on till the garrison at St. Andrews were defeated by French aid and made captives, in 1547.

The terms of surrender were violated by the victors, and Knox and others were made prisoners in the French galleys. In 1549 he was released and came to England, where, as we have seen, he spent five years. After the accession of Mary he remained in England as long as he could, and longer than was prudent, but finally, in January, 1554, fled to the Continent.

During the five years of his sojourn abroad, interrupted by a long and fruitful visit to Scotland, Knox was variously busy. Part of the time he was at Geneva, where he formed a fast friendship with Calvin. Here he studied with great diligence, and, though nearly fifty years old, took up the study of Hebrew to improve his knowledge of Scripture. The congregation of English exiles called him to Frankfort as their minister, and he accepted and faithfully served them till, in their dissensions over the

liturgy, the party favoring the Anglican ritual got the majority and forced Knox out, and he went back to Geneva. Meantime he got news from Scotland that the queen-regent (Mary of Guise, mother of Mary Stuart) was disposed for the moment to be lenient towards the Protestants. This favorable turn of affairs and other circumstances decided Knox to make a visit to Scotland and see what could be done for the cause. Leaving Geneva in August, 1555, Knox came first to Berwick and spent some time with his wife and her good mother, and then secretly proceeded to Edinburgh, intending to return soon to Berwick. But he found much to do in Scotland. At Edinburgh and other places he found the friends of reform eager to learn from him, and in private houses he preached and taught diligently, confirming and building up the Protestants and winning not a few converts.

After nearly a year of this labor he received a call from the English congregation at Geneva to become their pastor, and thought it best, on the whole, to accede to their request. So he returned to that city with his family and had a quiet and helpful pastorate there for several years. But his heart was in Scotland, and he joyfully listened to proposals from some of the leaders there to return and carry out the work of reform. The good results of Knox's visit had been shown, and it was felt that he was the man to carry on the work. He did not need any urging, and so, after some disappointments and delays, he left Geneva to take up his mighty labors, in the evening of his days, in Scotland, and landed at Leith in May, 1559. With this date the last and greatest stage of Knox's career as a reformer begins. On arriving in Scotland he found that circumstances had altered the queen-regent's policy, and instead of tolerating the reformers she was now joining hands with Archbishop Hamilton to suppress them. These measures of persecution awakened sympathy for the reformers, but meantime the Protestant cause was somewhat hurt by the indiscretion of a crowd at Perth, who, after a sermon from Knox, provoked by the attempt of a priest to celebrate mass in the church after the reformed services were concluded, rushed upon the church, destroyed the altar and images, and, proceeding further, when once aroused, sacked the monasteries in the town.

These events led to a state of civil warfare. The government sent troops to Perth, the Protestants gathered forces to defend themselves, and thus the lines were sharply drawn. For Romanism in Scotland it was the beginning of the end; but for Protestantism there was a long and often apparently doubtful conflict before the final victory. Knox's share in that struggle and victory was very great, but, of course, he was not alone. The preachers of less prominence, who had toiled during his absence and helped to maintain the cause, stood by him in his gladly welcomed leadership, and their ranks were continually strengthened by accessions from those who had been less decided, but now came out clearly for the new order. About this time the general body of Protestants had come to be known as "The Congregation," and those nobles who, in accordance with the Scottish feudal habits, took the direction of affairs for the general body, were called "Lords of the Congregation." Thus, in Scotland, as elsewhere, but in consonance with the peculiar institutions of the country, the secular rulers had large share in shaping the course of the Reformation.

Not very long after the affair at Perth the Lords of the Congregation invited Knox to preach on a certain day at St. Andrews, with a view of instituting reforms there. Knox was delighted at the prospect of revisiting the scene of his early ministry and of former defeat and captivity, and of thus fulfilling the prediction he had made while a prisoner in the galleys, that he would one day preach at St. Andrews again. But the archbishop naturally resented the intrusion, and threatened to send a force and have Knox shot if he entered the pulpit. As the Lords had only a few men on the ground, the leaders hesitated, and advised Knox to give up the attempt for the present. But Knox's blood was up, and he insisted on filling the appointment, among other things saying:¹ "As for fear of danger that may come to me, let no man be solicitous, for my life is in the custody of him whose glory I seek. I desire the hand nor weapon of no man to defend me. I only crave audience, which, if it be denied me at this time, I must seek where I may have it." He was allowed to have his way, and on the next day

¹ McCrie, p. 131.

preached without hindrance to a great congregation, the archbishop being afraid to execute his threat. He preached powerfully on our Lord's driving out the traders from the Temple, making the obvious application to the need of reforming Christian worship there and then. Several other sermons followed, and in consequence, not by a mob, but by orderly authority of the rulers of the town, the Catholic worship was abolished, the images and pictures removed from the church, and the monasteries destroyed. This was in June, 1559, and the example set by St. Andrews was followed by a number of other towns.

In July the people of Edinburgh, in a public assembly, called Knox to be their minister, and he accepted, and began his work at St. Giles church. But the regent's forces captured the city from the Lords of the Congregation, and, though Knox desired to remain, he was this time persuaded to prudence, left the congregation (protected by treaty) in the hands of a less obnoxious man, and retired. He now went on an arduous and highly successful preaching tour, visiting in two months many of the most important places in the kingdom. He then settled for a time at St. Andrews, till circumstances should admit of his resuming his position at Edinburgh. During the interval he was of course active in the events which marked the progress of affairs in church and state in Scotland. He preached much, wrote much, and in many ways encouraged and animated the ever-strengthening Protestant cause. The alliance with England and the deposition of the queen-regent by the Lords of the Congregation were followed by the death of the regent. A parliament was called to settle the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of the distracted nation. It met in Edinburgh in the summer of 1560, abolished the Catholic religion, and adopted a reformed confession of faith drawn up by Knox and other ministers.

In April, 1560, Knox had come back to Edinburgh as chief pastor, and for the remaining twelve years of his life that city is the principal scene of his labors. In addition to his preaching and administration of church affairs, and complicated, of course, with both, the main point of interest in his later career is his conflict with Queen Mary Stuart in her effort to reinstate the Catholic

religion. The romantic history of that misguided and unhappy lady lies apart from our narrative, but it is necessary to recall that the early death of her father, James V., had left her an infant queen, that her kingdom had been under the regency of Arran, and then of her mother, while she was a minor, absent in France, and married, while yet a girl, to the heir-apparent, afterwards for a very brief reign Francis II. After the death of her mother and then of her husband, the fair but unsuitably trained queen was invited by the Scottish nobles to come and take her kingdom. She arrived in Scotland in August 1561, and it was not long before the troubles of her unfortunate reign began. Though the Protestants were in power and had invited her return, Mary soon showed her fixed purpose to do all that she could to restore the old worship. Her mistake was natural, considering both her faults and her training, but it brought no end of trouble both on herself and her subjects. One of her first acts was to order a solemn mass to be said in Holyrood chapel in honor of her return. The leaders prevented the people from making a riot, and Knox himself counselled patience, but showed his feeling on the subject by saying at the end of his sermon that Sunday:¹ "That one mass was more fearful unto him than if ten thousand armed enemies were landed in any part of the realm of purpose to suppress the whole religion." Extravagant as this language seems, it shows that Knox was alive to the dangers which threatened the Protestant cause from the side of the queen, and events soon showed how just were his fears. But Knox was firm, unyielding, even severe, and in his sermons denounced the papacy and papal practices with no less vigor than formerly. McCrie gives a vivid presentation of the reformer's several famous interviews with the queen during these years. She tried the effect of argument, of flattery, of tears, of imperious anger, all in vain. If the bold preacher was too harsh and unfeeling, he was always faithful to his convictions, and if plain almost to rudeness, he was at least not disrespectful. He ever maintained his right to speak his conscience in his pulpit. Once Knox took occasion in a sermon seriously to object to the queen's marriage to any

¹ McCrie, p. 175.

papist. Mary was deeply offended, called the preacher to an interview, and in the course of it burst into passionate tears, and vowed she would be revenged. But Knox said ¹ that "her grace and he had at different times been engaged in controversy, and he had never before perceived her offended with him. When it should please God to deliver her from the bondage of error in which she had been trained up, through want of instruction in the truth, he trusted that her majesty would not find the liberty of his tongue offensive. Out of the pulpit, he believed few had occasion to complain of him; but there he was not his own master, but was bound to obey Him who commanded him to speak plainly, and to flatter no flesh on the face of the earth." Strange contrast between these two so brought into contact, with unutterable disharmony of character and of principles—both inflexible in their several ways—the queen lovely even in her faults and weaknesses, the reformer unlovely in his virtues and strength. The crowning effort of Mary was to secure Knox's condemnation on a charge of treason, because of certain expressions in a letter he had written in defence of some of his Protestant brethren, who had perhaps acted imprudently in opposing the Catholic worship at Holyrood during the queen's absence. He was tried before the Lords in her presence, she herself taking the part of accuser in a lively way; but the Lords, to their credit, be it said, were not to be browbeaten nor cajoled, and Knox's firm and candid defence secured his acquittal. This was in 1563.

The queen's marriage with Darnley was in nowise pleasing to Knox, and the royal pair found means to annoy the free-spoken preacher. The murder of Darnley and the queen's flight and indecent marriage to Bothwell excited Knox's horror. He, of course, approved of her deposition, and preached the sermon at Stirling on the occasion of the crowning of her infant son as James VI. Knox greatly rejoiced in the appointment of Murray to the regency, and was filled with satisfaction at the wise administration of that able and incorruptible patriot. The assassination of Murray filled him with grief, and when the queen's party took possession of Edinburgh he was

¹ McCrie, p. 206 f.

forced again to retire for a while to St. Andrews. Soon, however, the civil strife was abated, and he was once more allowed to return, and this time to end his days, among his beloved flock. His health rapidly declined, and in 1572, just as the elevation of Morton to the regency promised better days, the old hero reached the end of his journey. For some time he had been longing to depart, and his last days were filled with peace and serenity in view of his speedy release. He died November 24, 1572. As friends stood about his grave the newly elected regent, the Earl of Morton, expressed the thought of the time and the judgment of posterity in the brief but merited eulogy: "There lies he who never feared the face of man."

The character of Knox was an eminently vigorous one. The strong individuality of the man and his real greatness lie on the surface. He could and did receive influential impressions from others, as from Wishart and Rough, in his early years, and from Calvin during his sojourn in Europe, but he was ever his own man. If, as McCrie concedes,¹ he falls below the three great continental reformers, he is at least to be placed next below them. Inferior to them all as theologian and scholar, he also lacked the geniality and popular power of Luther and Zwingli, and did not approach Calvin in constructive genius nor in fine balance of judgment. In his austerity of morals and censure of evil he was more like Calvin, with whom in views of truth and duty he most nearly agreed. Knox's faults were those of a strong and vehement nature. He was severe in his judgments, fearless and tactless in expressing his opinions, and often unnecessarily sharp and extreme in his language. But he does not seem to have indulged in coarseness such as marred the language of Luther and Zwingli; and, notwithstanding his severity, there seems to have been more exercise, as well as expression of tenderness, than with Calvin. He made and kept warm attachments, and in his personal and domestic relations gave and received affection. His moral fibre was of the toughest sort, and yet once, at least, in the negotiations with the English court, he counselled a crooked policy; and while he did not

¹ P. 290 f.

advise he did in a measure defend the murders of Cardinal Beaton and of David Rizzio. In his personal life he was pure from taint and absolutely free from corruption. Various slanders assailed him by the malice of his foes, but they fell fruitless to the ground. His one absorbing aim in life was to establish the Reformation in Scotland, and to this purpose he brought a disinterestedness, a courage, a hopefulness, a diligence and a faith in God and truth which keep his name safe amid the truly great of history.

Little can be said as to the preaching of Knox beyond what has already been mentioned or suggested in the account of his life and character. The reason is apparent in the following statement of McCrie¹: "Of the many sermons preached by him during his ministry he published but one, which was extorted from him by peculiar circumstances. It affords a very favorable specimen of his talents, and shows that if he had applied himself to writing he was qualified for excelling in that department. He had a ready command of language, and expressed himself with great perspicuity, animation and force." The occasion referred to by McCrie was this: Soon after his marriage to the queen, Darnley, for appearances' sake, went to hear Knox preach, and took violent exceptions to certain allusions in the sermon. On account of it Knox was inhibited from preaching for a while, and, it seems, at the request of the privy council, or to vindicate himself, wrote out as nearly as he could the sermon that he had preached.² One other sermon is mentioned in the list of his writings, and there are some expositions of various Scriptures and devotional or hortatory tracts, which show that the common report of his power in unfolding and applying Scripture is justified. The accounts of his eloquence and the effects of his work in the pulpit are his title to rank among the great preachers. His power over men was wonderful. Small of stature and frail in body, like Calvin, he was far more vehement and excitable than the reserved Frenchman. His eye gleamed and his frame worked with the inward power of his convictions, and his mastery of his audience was that of the born speaker. The first sermon at St. Andrews, when he attacked the

¹ P. 298.

² Fish, *Masterpieces*, etc., Vol. II., p. 207 ff.

papacy, showed his coming power, and the far later one in the same place, when he defied Archbishop Hamilton's threats and put aside the warnings of his friends to urge the immediate reformation of worship, was a triumph of brave and powerful preaching.

6. CONTEMPORARIES OF KNOX

We must not allow the preëminence of Knox to blind us to the fact that in his time there were a number of other faithful and able preachers of the Reformation in Scotland. One of his own noblest traits of character was the cordial recognition which he gave to the worth and services of his brethren; and in their relations to each other there was nothing arrogant on his part nor subservient on theirs. It will suffice, however, to mention briefly a few of the more prominent of these men, for none of them attained to any distinguished rank as preachers, nor do their sermons remain to exhibit their individual characteristics.¹

One of the humble and faithful ones who labored amid discouragement and peril in Scotland during Knox's exile was William Harlow. He was not a man of much education, but was well grounded in the Scriptures. He had been a tailor at Edinburgh, but, becoming a Protestant, went to England in the time of Edward VI., and was employed there as a preacher in some humble capacity. He afterwards returned to Scotland and preached "with great fervor and diligence" in different places, to the end of his life.

The man who stood next to Knox in pulpit power and extent of influence was John Willock (d. 1585), a native of Ayrshire. He pursued his studies at Glasgow University, and was for some time a monk at Ayr, but early became reformer and forsook the monastery. He, like Harlow, went to England, but was there in Henry VIII.'s reign, and suffered persecution when the Six Articles were being enforced. Afterwards he was appointed a chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk under Edward, but left England under the next reign and practised medicine

¹ Mention in McCrie's *Life of Knox*, and articles in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

at Emden, in Friesland. Here he got in favor with the Duchess of Friesland, and was by her sent on an ostensibly commercial and political mission to Scotland in 1555. He used his opportunity to encourage and spread the reform movement. Later we find him settled as preacher at Ayr, where he did good work, and made such strong friends that, though tried for heresy and outlawed, the sentence against him could not be executed. He joined Knox on his arrival at Edinburgh, and he it was who stayed and preached there while the city was in possession of the queen-regent and Knox had to retire for a while. Willock was as firm as Knox, but a great deal more tactful and prudent, and his services at that crisis were particularly valuable. The queen-regent tried to have the Catholic worship restored at St. Giles' church, but Willock's decided, though respectful, resistance triumphed. He gave his opinion, when asked by the nobles, in favor of the queen-regent's deposition, but, nevertheless, visited her in her last illness. He filled various pulpits and other positions of prominence and influence in Scotland, but later, for some reason, went to England, where he died as rector of a church in Leicestershire, in 1585. The friendship between him and Knox was close and cordial, and his services to the Reformation were important and lasting. McCrie says of him, "Willock was not inferior to Knox in learning, and though he did not equal him in eloquence and intrepidity, surpassed him in affability, in moderation, and in address; qualities which enabled him sometimes to maintain his station and to accomplish his purposes when his colleague could not act with safety or with success."

Another of Knox's very close friends was Christopher Goodman (d. 1603), who was born and educated in England, and was one of those Frankfort exiles who objected to the use of the English liturgy there and retired to Geneva. He and Knox were joint ministers to the English church at Geneva, and after Knox came back to Scotland he earnestly urged his beloved and faithful colleague to join and help him in establishing the Reformation. Goodman heeded the request, and, coming to Scotland with Knox's family, he rendered valuable help to the cause. He was for a time pastor at Ayr and also at St. Andrews.

He was highly esteemed as a preacher, but, like his greater friend and colleague, he had a sharp tongue and a vehement spirit that often hurt more than they helped. After a while he left Scotland and returned to England, where he had trouble with Elizabeth's prelates on account of his nonconforming views, and died, a very old man, in 1603.

The youngest of this group, who came into influence chiefly after Knox's death, is James Lawson (d. 1584). He claims mention for two things. One is that he was the first man to teach Hebrew in Scotland; having been appointed to a professorship by the regent Murray at St. Andrews. The other is that from this post he was urgently besought by Knox to come to his help and relief in the pastorate at St. Giles' church, in Edinburgh, when the old reformer felt that his days were few. Knox's last public service was at the installation of Lawson as his colleague and successor in the pastorate.

Besides those who have been mentioned there were others also who preached and toiled for the establishing and confirming of the Reformation in Scotland. The value of their labors and the solidity of their work appear in the subsequent history of Protestant Scotland, and in the power and influence of English-speaking Presbyterianism throughout the world. Many of the greatest divines and noblest preachers whose lives have blessed mankind have traced their religious lineage from Knox and his co-laborers in Scotland.

CHAPTER XV

ROMAN CATHOLIC PREACHING AND PREACHERS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Inasmuch as the Reformation introduced and established a new epoch in preaching, it has seemed best to follow that tendency among the reformers themselves, and show how in the lands chiefly affected by Protestantism there flourished numbers of notable preachers. But we must not lose sight of the preaching within the Roman Catholic church during this epoch. For centuries we followed the course of development in preaching within

that body, and that development received important modification from forces both within and without the church itself during the sixteenth century. Neither the Catholic church as a whole, nor its preaching in particular, was the same after the Reformation as before it, nor what they would have been without that great movement. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to consider carefully what was the relation of the Reformation to Catholic preaching; and after that we may profitably give some attention to the leading Catholic preachers of the age.

I. THE REFORMATION AND CATHOLIC PREACHING

It is fair to say in the outset that Catholic and Protestant writers are not likely to agree, and as a matter of fact do not agree, as to the reality, the extent and the character of the influence which the Reformation had upon Catholic preaching. Thus Zanotto¹ depreciates the effect of the Reformation by emphasizing the fact that there was until the Council of Trent no marked improvement in Catholic preaching, but, rather, a fall after Savonarola, giving as two causes for this decline the polemical spirit engendered by the dispute with Protestantism, and the remnant of merely paganizing influences from the Renaissance. This would imply that all the improvement in the Catholic preaching in the sixteenth century came much later than the Protestant outbreak, and was due to the reformatory measures of the Council of Trent. Now there is truth in all this; but it is not the whole truth. Naturally the Protestant preaching itself showed first the heightened tone of the reformatory impulse, and the Council of Trent did work some reforms. But what made that body pass laws for the improvement of preaching, as well as other measures of reform? It is idle to intimate that the Reformation did not influence it. Another Catholic writer on the history of preaching, the Abbé Boucher,² goes even further and says, "The church itself, by its councils, by its most illustrious pontiffs and its most holy doctors, recalled the preachers to hard studies, to the gravity of the priesthood, to the simplicity

¹ *Storia della Predicazione*, p. 147 e seg.

² *L'Éloquence de la Chaire, ou Histoire littéraire de la Prédication*, p. 271.

of Christian speech. But this reform could only be accomplished slowly, and took a century to show itself. It was during the sixteenth century that Protestantism came and robbed the church of a large part of Europe. It dried up at the same time the fountain of pulpit eloquence in those unhappy lands. There is talking in the pulpit, but no more preaching." The absurd and extreme one-sidedness and inaccuracy of this representation are apparent, but it is an illustration of how Catholics wish to ignore any possible help which the Reformation may have rendered to preaching, either out of or within the Catholic church. On the other hand, Protestant writers—especially the Germans¹—may be inclined to depreciate any improvement in Catholic preaching, or, if they see it, to assign the whole of it to the influence of the Reformation; forgetting that the Reformation itself was primarily a Catholic movement, and that not all who desired to promote reforms left the church, so that there was progressive movement within as well as helpful stimulus from without. On one point, however, both sides practically agree, and that is that the improved tone of Catholic preaching—whatever its cause—was not very prompt in displaying itself in the sixteenth century. The immediate and direct influence of Protestantism on Catholic preaching was, for reasons already hinted and more clearly to be shown, not a distinct improvement; for the loss of so many of the best preachers, who went out from the church, and the sharpening of the polemic spirit, were injurious to the Catholic pulpit. Yet there were some elements of improvement at work, and these came to fuller power later in the century, and produced still better fruit in the next.

We must recall here something of the state of Catholic preaching in the early part of the sixteenth century. Romanist writers recognize and concede many of the faults

¹ Thus Christlieb says of the Catholic preaching of the sixteenth century that it "shows itself wholly governed by polemic against the reformatory doctrines. In the everywhere threatened revolt from Rome there is defence of that which exists, and only too often the extirpation of heresy is its ground-theme. The conflict with Protestantism, strong in preaching (most commonly only that!), drives also the Catholic Church to more diligence in the homiletical sphere." *Gesch. der Pred.*, in Herzog.

which Protestants charge against the Catholic preaching of the time. It had suffered from the arid speculation of scholasticism, from the puerile exaggerations of the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture, from the cooling influence of the Renaissance, and from the general deterioration in clerical character and pulpit power. If the reformers magnified these faults and ignored the better elements which remained in Romanist preaching, and if the Catholics only partially realized and confessed the evil and sought to break the force of criticism by charging similar and worse defects upon the Protestant pulpit, why, that is only the way of debate when there are wide differences and strong feelings between parties.

We have seen how the reformers gradually withdrew from the old church; and they carried their preaching with them. But there were left behind in the Catholic church reformers of at least three different varieties: (1) There were scholars both of the cool, satirical sort, like Erasmus, and of the devout and earnest sort, like Le Fèvre. (2) There were the pious and mystical, some who came very near being reformers, like Staupitz, and others, who were unshaken in their allegiance to Rome, like Luiz of Granada. (3) There were the thoroughgoing Romanists, who combined with a real desire for the reform of the church, the equally strong one of putting down or refuting the Protestant heresy. These, too, had their different representatives, such as Caraffa, the prelate, and Peter Canisius, the Jesuit and preacher. Now the forces for reform, represented by such men as these and their followers, were by no means inactive. In Italy especially there was a strong movement for improved conditions in preaching. The order of Theatines, founded by Gaetano, Caraffa and others, had preaching in mind as well as other reforms; and the Capuchin monks of the order of St. Francis were started to revive both the stricter asceticism and the preaching traditions of the earlier history of the order. The eminent prelate and later saint, Carlo Borromeo of Milan, earnestly sought, by precept and example, to bring about a better type of preaching. From Spain the order of Jesuits came forth to labor for the ascendancy of Rome in all departments, and not the least in preaching; and in their ranks earlier

and later were found some of the most powerful Catholic preachers. Treatises on preaching and helps for preachers appeared. Valerio, in Italy, and Luiz of Granada, in Spain, put forth works of considerable merit on the art of preaching, and some collections of sermons were made for the benefit of the needy in that direction. Among these was one from the famous John Eck, who disputed with Carlstadt and Luther at Leipzig. Finally, the Council of Trent took the matter in hand, and, among other reformatory measures, passed canons which had the improvement of preaching directly in view. One of these¹ made it the duty of bishops and pastors to see that there should be preaching in the churches at least on Sundays, feast days and fast days; and during Advent and Lent every day.

The facts mentioned show that inside the Catholic church there was during the Reformation epoch a decided movement for the reform of preaching; but there were also stimulative influences from without, which, if they did not produce, at least powerfully coöperated with, these inner tendencies. While the Romanist pulpit did not so much as the Protestant preaching respond to those general external influences which have been pointed out before, it was by no means unmoved by them. These, it will be recalled, were the large, progressive spirit of the new age, the impulse from the revival in arts and letters, the effect of criticism upon abuses, and the like. Traditional and conservative as it was in its mediævalism, the Romanist pulpit could not turn a wholly deaf ear to the world's demand for better things.

More particularly, however, the stimulative influence of the Protestant revolt itself is to be considered. The reformers, as we know, did not content themselves with merely criticising or bewailing the defects and decay of the preaching of the age. Their polemic and their example alike served to emphasize the evil conditions which marred the Catholic pulpit. Men do not like to have their faults pointed out by their opponents, but they sometimes profit by the unfriendly criticism, notwithstanding their resentment and denials. Traces of this influence appear

¹ *Sess. XXIV., de Ref., cap. 4; referred to by Rothe, Gesch. der. Pred., S. 385.*

in many of the Catholic sermons of the time. John Wild, as we shall see, confessed to having received help from the "innovators;" and in others, where not confessed, the service rendered is at least apparent. Besides this we must consider the effect of rivalry. It was not in human nature for the Catholic preachers to see the Protestants winning such victories by preaching and not be moved to greater and better exertions on their own side. Naturally this effect is more distinctly apparent in Germany, where the conflict was dubious, than in those lands where one or the other party had the advantage. And, finally, the effect of the Catholic polemic against Protestantism must also be considered. Not only in receiving attack and in emulation of their rivals, but in their own sharp and determined attack upon the Protestant position, did the Catholics find stimulus towards the exercise and strengthening, at least in one direction, of their preaching. The injurious effect of controversy on the preaching of both parties must be admitted, so far as the religious spirit is concerned, but both frequency and vigor in the work were promoted thereby.

We may now pertinently ask, Did these forces for improvement really accomplish anything? Do we find as a consequence of these tendencies and influences that Catholic preaching in the sixteenth century was decidedly better than in the fifteenth? The answer cannot be an emphatic affirmative, neither can it be a negative. There was some improvement, but not as much as might have been expected. But forces were set in motion that did alter for the better the general character of Catholic preaching, though, as Catholics themselves show, these improvements were not fully apparent till a later period.

A distinct gain was made in the regard for preaching. Perhaps that regard has never become so high as it was in the thirteenth century, and yet there has been increased respect, as compared with the neglect of the two following centuries. And it is likely that not in any age since the Reformation—unless a part of the eighteenth century be an exception—has the pulpit been as little esteemed among Catholics as it was in the fifteenth century.

A very notable gain has been in the improved character of the Catholic clergy as a whole since the Reforma-

tion. This has regard to both morals and culture. The proportion of unfit men in the ministry was appreciably reduced by the reforms of the sixteenth century. This statement does not mean that there were only bad men before or only good men since the Reformation in the Catholic ministry; but it does mean that there has been a great improvement. Ignorance and vice have not been wholly banished from among either Catholics or Protestants, but some things which were tolerated in the fifteenth century have been under the ban ever since that time.

Relatively to the irreverent and often absurd misuse of Scripture, which was only too common in the mediæval times, there has been a notable improvement in Catholic preaching. There is much to be desired in the post-reformation sermons in this regard, but we do not find in modern Catholic preaching anything like as much of that wild allegorizing and unworthy distortion of Scripture as existed before the Reformation. It is worthy of remark that the sermons of John Wild and of Peter Canisius, both of whom labored in Germany in near conflict with the reformers, especially show traces of a better interpretation and application of Scripture, and also of a tendency to emphasize the importance of scripture exposition as compared with other modes of preaching. The only homiletical remains from Canisius are a series of *Notes on the Gospels and Epistles*—that is sketches of homilies on the lessons appointed for the sacred days of the year; and among the far more voluminous works of Wild both expository homilies and commentaries occupy a large place. The quality of the exposition in both leaves much to be desired, but it is by no means so forced and so allegorical as in former times was the fashion.

While the Catholic pulpit has never reached the power over the people that it had in the central Middle Ages—particularly the thirteenth century—it at least recovered much of the ground that it lost in the fifteenth century. This rise in popular power was due to all the foregoing considerations, and was particularly enhanced by the now confirmed use of the vernacular languages as the medium of pulpit address. We saw how this tendency was growing through the Middle Ages; but the Latin sermon has become a thing of the past since the Reformation. On

some academic and ecclesiastical occasions, when the audience made it tolerable, the sermon was given in Latin; and for the sake of securing a wider circle of readers many of those spoken in the native tongues were translated and published in Latin, and we have many in that form only, the originals having perished. But the ordinary use of Latin in preaching had ceased before the Reformation, and this happy change received emphatic endorsement and perpetuation at that epoch.

Although some changes and improvements were effected in the general character of Catholic preaching by the purifying forces of the Reformation, yet the characteristics acquired through centuries of development remained essentially unchanged. Among these of course are many features which abide in all preaching and are not distinctively Catholic; but Christian, historic, permanent. These are not here under consideration. But if we speak of some matters distinctively Catholic we enter at once the realm of dispute, for these will seem excellencies to the Romanist and faults to the Protestant.

The place of the sermon in worship remained as it was. The Reformation did not rescue it from its subordination to liturgy. If the Reformed churches went too far in making the sermon supreme, and the Anglican church did not go far enough, the Catholic church allowed it to remain relatively insignificant in comparison with the mass and other ceremonies. The priest in the worship continued to be rather the celebrant of mysteries than the preacher of truth. Ritual to strike the senses and the sentiments, rather than the exposition of divine truth to enlighten the mind and mould the character, remained too much the character of Catholic worship. Under such conditions there was an inevitable depreciation and weakening of preaching.

The Reformation mitigated but did not wholly cure certain faults of method in the Catholic preaching of the times. The scholastic tendency was still too much in evidence, along with the multiplied and pedantic quotation from the Fathers and church Doctors. The best preachers of the age are not wholly free from this—as Musso, Villanova, Canisius—although they do show considerable improvement. But in the hands of those

who were not so much affected by the new spirit this defect was still more apparent.

The coarseness and irreverence which found place in many of the mediæval Catholic sermons were not entirely banished from those of the Reformation period. It is not denied that here some reformers were equally guilty with their opponents, but that fact does not excuse either party. Still it must be gladly recognized that in this there was improvement over former times, though not complete amendment. And the same remark, as we have already seen, may be made in regard to the use of the Scripture in the Catholic sermons of the age. Many of them indicate a better practice, but still there is too much of the allegorical interpretation, and of forced application. Besides this the use of extra-biblical material continues. The Council of Trent placed the Apocryphal books on a footing with the genuine Scriptures, and they are quoted and used as such. Tradition and legend still supply sermon material. Tales and eulogies of saints and martyrs exceed the legitimate uses of illustration. The authority of the Fathers and Doctors is too highly esteemed in comparison with that of Scripture.

But the most serious Protestant criticism upon the Catholic preaching of the sixteenth century is that which lies against its doctrinal content. It was this that forced the split; the other matters could have been mended inside the church. But naturally at this point the Catholic refuses to confess judgment, though as to other matters he may be willing to admit the existence of some faults. Those great fundamental Christian verities upon which Catholics and Protestants agree are of course not here in question; and it is not denied that in the Romanist preaching of the sixteenth century, controversial as it was, much essential truth upon both doctrine and morals was proclaimed. At the same time the proclamation and defence of those unscriptural accretions and perversions which characterize the Roman theology are the prominent features of Catholic preaching at the period we have in hand. The mass and transubstantiation; penance with its three elements of contrition, confession and satisfaction; good works and merits, and the nature of faith and justification; the adoration of Mary and the saints;

purgatory and prayers for the dead; all these were preached, not indeed to the total neglect, but yet to the great obscuration of pure gospel truth.

We have already had more than one occasion to observe how large a place controversy had in the preaching of the Reformation period. The reason for this is sufficiently obvious, and its effect in stimulating the preaching of the reformers has been previously noticed. Its place and influence in Catholic preaching are now to be further considered. As a general truth it must be borne in mind that controversy has both good and evil effects in preaching. Its good is seen in the spur to diligence, the clarifying of points at issue, the intellectual quickening, the strengthening of conviction and earnestness, which are its usual accompaniments. Its evil appears in the angry passions, the distortions of truth, the personal animosities, the intemperate expressions, which only too often mar its own legitimate working. Fairness demands the statement that both the good and evil of controversy appear in both the great parties to the religious strife of the sixteenth century, and the preaching of both reformers and Catholics exhibits the corresponding effects. Yet it is also fair to say that in some respects the advantage lay with the Protestants, and their preaching shows on the whole more of the good and less of the evil of polemics than is the case with their Romanist adversaries. This was due to a number of things, a few of which may be instanced: The reformers were the attacking party and many of the things which they attacked were notoriously evil and had to be so admitted, while others which were defended were yet placed in question in the minds of multitudes of thoughtful and devout Christians; they were the ones who made the most sacrifices for conscience' sake, and with whom accordingly the weight of moral power lay; they had a simpler task, for their one great authority was the Scripture, complicated with fewer traditions and dissociated from many historic abuses; they made preaching their main instrument of warfare and more unreservedly and warmly devoted themselves to it. Such considerations as these serve to explain why the evil effects of controversy, though unhappily bad enough, were not so manifest in the Protes-

tant as in the Catholic preaching of the Reformation age. But even if the comparison be not admitted, the fact that polemic against Protestantism was hurtfully prominent in that preaching cannot be denied. Rothe¹ asserts that it was the principal element, and Christlieb² has the same opinion. These Protestant judgments are confirmed by Catholic writers also, though they naturally take a very different view of the character of the defence made by the Romanists.³ Thus Leroux⁴ says: "The Reformation met in its way vigorous champions to combat it; the church had its defenders. The preachers took pains to warn the faithful against the perils to their faith, and to refute the new belief which threatened to destroy it; in the pulpit especially the greatest zeal was displayed." The same writer contends that the Catholic preachers were more dignified and less bitter than the Protestants, and far less rude and coarse. Yet he admits⁵ that they sometimes descended to ridicule and satire. He instances as an especially keen and effective controversialist the Franciscan archbishop of Brixen, John Nas, and makes several quotations from a sermon of his in reply to a certain Müller—which may be a fictitious name, as there was no prominent Protestant preacher of that name at the time. As Leroux quotes these paragraphs with approval, we may transcribe them as fair specimens of Catholic pulpit polemic against Lutheranism. Thus Bishop Nas: "All the popes opposed the heretics; also the heretics always treated the popes as anti-Christ. That is true, and is so to-day, to the great honor of the pope; for the heretics preach a false Christ, who does not require either obedience to the will of God, nor observance of the divine law,⁶ and who does not prescribe either love or penitence, contenting himself simply with faith without works. Now the pope anathematizes and condemns this Christ, he is his enemy, the enemy of all his members and of all his sect. So, then, the pope is rightly called an anti-Christ. He is the enemy of all the false Christs, and condemns them. So this fool Müller does not know what he is say-

¹ S. 385.² *Ante*, p. 526, note.³ See references to Zanotto and Boucher, *ante*, p. 526.⁴ *Les Prédicateurs célèbres de l'Allemagne*, pp. 211, 213.⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 219 et suiv.⁶ Calvin, for instance!

ing, he vomits hot and cold without knowing it; there is just as much relation in the analogy which he pretends to establish as there is between the fist and the eye." He speaks of Luther's tract on the *Babylonian Captivity* as "thought and written by the devil." Reverting to his opponent, he says: "This crazy Müller is as consistent in his talk as an empty flour sack. To-day he brags on the Wittenbergers as better than all the rest of the world, he makes them out saints, then all of a sudden, as a conclusion to the discourse, he reproaches their vices and threatens them with coming ruin if they do not like his preaching and put it into practice."

This has a certain vigor and liveliness, to be sure, but what else has it? Doubtless there was better polemical preaching than this represents, doubtless, also, there was worse; but, on the whole, the controversial element of the Catholic preaching of this age cannot be regarded as greatly to its credit, either for depth or dignity.

2. THE LEADING CATHOLIC PREACHERS

As compared with the preceding and following times, and as compared with the Protestants of their own times, the number of really great Catholic preachers in the sixteenth century was very small. These were found chiefly in Italy and Spain, with a few in Germany, in the other lands scarcely any that demand serious notice. In England the famous Catholic prelates of the time—Wolsey, Gardiner, Tunstall, Bonner and Pole—were distinguished for other things than preaching. In France a few are mentioned by writers on the history of preaching,¹ as Vigor of Narbonne, Charles de Lorraine, Jean Boucher, Pierre Divolé, Edmond Auger, and others. But it is significant that Boucher, in his so-called "Literary History of Preaching,"² himself a Frenchman, should say of this period in France that "the sixteenth century permits us to make the excursion across foreign literatures; we shall return to France for the preachers of the League and of the reign of Henry IV." In other words, even to a French Catholic writer, the preachers of his church and country in the early sixteenth century do not seem

¹ As Zanotto and Christlieb, *op. cit.*

² *L'Éloquence de la Chaire*, etc., p. 274.

worth mentioning in comparison with those of other lands. In the countries of northern and eastern Europe a few are mentioned by Zanotto, evidently to fill up, but there were none of distinction. So we may confine our view to the preachers of Germany, Italy and Spain.

In Germany, John Eck, the clever opponent of Luther, was a man of learning and influence, but was not specially significant as a preacher, though he contributed a collection of sketches, or short expository sermons, on the Gospels, in aid of the clergy. A similar service was performed by Martin Eisengrein, also not otherwise significant. There is also a volume of sermons from John Witzel, who was a milder polemic than some and sought a more conciliatory way of meeting Protestantism than was common. More sharp in controversy, as we have had occasion to see, was John Nas, who was an Alsatian by birth, first joined the Franciscans as a lay brother, and was afterwards, because of his readiness in speech, made a preacher, and became one of the cleverest and most noted opponents of the Reformation. But by all odds the most important Romanist preachers in Germany at this period were Wild and Canisius, and they are entitled to more extended notice than the rest.

A man of decided talent and merit was the celebrated Cathedral preacher at Mainz, John Wild (d. 1554), or, in the Latin form, Johannes Ferus.¹ A veil of obscurity covers the birthplace, parentage and early years of John Wild. It appears that he was of German birth, and that about 1520 he joined the Franciscans, no doubt from motives of piety and devotion to the Catholic church. In 1528 he was appointed by the elector of Mainz to the post of afternoon preacher at the Cathedral in that city, and was soon afterwards made guardian of his order for the region about Mainz. Here he was diligent and popular in preaching for many years. His learning, piety and eloquence gave him wide influence; and his amiable spirit and aversion to polemics were remarkable in that tem-

¹ Leroux, *Les Prédicateurs célèbres de l'Allemagne*; various cyclopædia articles; and a Latin *Dissertatio de Johanne Fero, monacho et concionatore Moguntino, teste veritatis evangelicæ*, by E. G. Dieterich, presented for his degree at Altdorf in 1723. Also a Latin translation of Wild's sermons, published in 1559.

pestuous age. By 1545 he had become widely known as one of the most important preachers of the times, and he drew large congregations. In 1552 Albert of Brandenburg, also electoral archbishop of Mainz, having become Protestant, found it necessary to reduce the city to his authority by force, and captured it. He greatly respected Wild, and tried to win him to Protestantism by asking him to abandon his Franciscan gown; but Wild answered, "This habit has been with me these many years and has never harmed me; why should I leave it now?" Probably Albert would not have removed him from his place as preacher had he renounced his order; as it was, he was displaced by a Protestant preacher for a while, but on Albert's death he was restored to his pulpit at the Cathedral. He did not, however, live very long after this, but died in 1554.

Wild made and filled his own place among the preachers of his time. In learning he was abreast of the age, being acquainted with Hebrew and Greek, and well read in history and theology, patristic and mediæval. In character he was above all reproach for piety and justly esteemed by Catholics and Protestants alike for his amiability, moderation and earnestness. His theological position was a mediating one.¹ He learned much from the reformers, and approached them in many particulars both of doctrine and method. He said that "from the error of the moderns he had here and there dug out a pearl," but he qualified this by saying further that if he had borrowed from the innovators he believed it was only such things as were in accord with the church doctrines. He proclaimed his independence by saying, "I flatter no one, but purely announce to you the gospel in such a way as I shall answer for it to the Supreme Judge." As a consequence, his writings and sermons were admired and quoted by some Protestants, and Dieterich has shown that it is possible to cull from his works many clear and striking statements dear to the reformers. For example, as to Scripture, in rebuking those who would allege obscurity of the Bible as an excuse for not obeying its precepts, he teaches that the Scripture should be read by all, that it

¹ This point is well discussed and illustrated by quotations in the *Dissertation* of Dieterich.

can be understood by the common man, and that it should be explained by its own light. In one place he roundly says, "*Sola scriptura regula est veritatis.*" And so, while not discarding the Catholic traditions and usages, he puts them below Scripture. One of his utterances is well worth quoting as an example both of his manner and his thought. He says: "In the gospel Christ has touched upon many things which now exist among us Christians, who, after the manner of the Pharisees, are taken up, not only with fasts, but also with all the church regulations; who, as Christ himself said, strain out the gnat and swallow the camel. Yea, there are many things (if, indeed, I must acknowledge the truth and judge of it) in which our Christianity has become nothing else than an empty pharisaism—outward show, in which one finds many ceremonies but little righteousness, much song and little devotion, much appearance and little truth, much word and little spirit, the breaking off from certain kinds of food, but no breaking off from sins. On the former there is insistence, the latter is forgotten. When we hold fast the church regulation it is a great thing, when we despise God's commandment, yea, daily sin against it, no harm is done." This earnest rebuke is only too sadly appropriate to all times and churches, but it is gratifying to find a Catholic of eminence who dared so to express himself in those days.

As a preacher Wild had the talents and spirit that always attract and command attention. During his long service as Cathedral preacher at Mainz his audiences were large and his influence great. His published sermons are numerous. He spoke in German and some of his discourses are preserved in that tongue, but a very large number in Latin translations also. They once had large circulation among both Protestants and Catholics. As he said, they were not intended for the learned alone, but for the common people. In addition to their doctrinal import, already considered, the sermons are marked by their prevailing expository character. They are chiefly homilies on the Scripture books, and easily pass into commentaries, of which he also wrote a number. And so we may sum up by saying that for his emphasis on Scripture, for his grasp of evangelical truth, for his inde-

pendence and yet moderation, for his earnest piety and amiable character, and for his sustained power in the pulpit, John Wild must be ranked with the very best of the few who attained distinction as preachers among the Catholics of his age.

A very different man, but no less eminent in his diverse way, was the famous Jesuit preacher and polemic Peter Canisius (1521-1597).¹ Born in 1521, of excellent family, at Nimeguen, in the province of Gueldres, he was educated carefully in preparatory schools and at the University of Cologne, where he took the regular degrees in course and was especially devoted to theology. He was the first German of any importance to join the newly founded Society of Jesus, and his accession was hailed with pleasure and proved to be distinguished. In 1543 Faber came to Germany to establish the order there, and Canisius, then twenty-two years old, and already a very promising scholar and preacher, was won. He was sent by his archbishop, at the age of twenty-six, to take part in the deliberations of the Council of Trent, and rendered good service for the short time that he was there. Later he was sent to Rome, where for several years he studied and worked under the immediate supervision of Loyola himself, and also served a year as teacher and preacher at Messina.

After all these preparatory years he was at last sent back to his life work in Germany. At first he taught and preached at Ingolstadt with great applause, and his services were much sought after in many places. At the earnest request of Ferdinand of Austria he was sent to Vienna, where for a number of years he did effective work in the interests of his order and of the Catholic church. During this time he prepared and published a Catechism which has ranked among the works of that character most highly esteemed by Catholics. His preaching also drew great crowds, and did much to give to the Romanist cause its abiding strength in Vienna and throughout Austria. Canisius was offered a bishopric, but steadily refused. Afterwards he labored with great

¹ Authorities before noted, but especially the art. in Wetzler und Welte; Canisius' *Notae Evangelicae*, in an edition published at Freiburg, 1591.

effect in Bavaria, and then in other parts of Germany. He not only put new life and courage into his Catholic brethren everywhere, but is said to have been very successful also in winning back many Protestants to the Romanist faith. So highly were his abilities regarded as a disputant against Protestantism that he was especially deputed by the pope to write a reply to the famous *Magdeburg Centuries*, the church history written from the Protestant point of view. Many engagements and labors hindered the production of Canisius' reply, but when it at last appeared it was considered very satisfactory to his side. Thus variously and strenuously occupied in many places in Germany, Canisius yet lived to old age, not dying till 1597. In his lifetime and since, he has been regarded as the ablest defender of Romanism in Germany during the time in which he lived, his name is held in veneration, not only among Jesuits, but among Catholics generally, and in 1864 Pius IX. pronounced him "blessed"—the degree next below sainthood.

Besides the history and catechism already mentioned, Canisius wrote and published a number of theological and exegetical works. The latter are particularly significant because they show the effect of the Protestant exegesis in forcing this foremost Catholic disputant in Germany also to employ that weapon. The Romanist estimate of Canisius will appear from the following passage from the article in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*: "Unpublished manuscript expressions of his, still preserved, show how clearly and profoundly he understood the essence of Protestantism. Far more impressive than harnessed defence appeared to him the positive teaching and strengthening of the Catholics; and, therefore, this element dominates in all his writings. Luther's coarse popular wit, passion, agitator's rhetoric, are wholly lacking in him. Instead there appears in his (mostly Latin) works the closest familiarity with Holy Scripture, extensive acquaintance with the Fathers and with the positive and scholastic theology, an earnest humanistic culture, great reading of the works of the Protestant theologians, a dignified polemical readiness to strike, piety, decision, and the mildness of a generally apostolic man." From the prodigious activity of Canisius as a

preacher the literary remains are slight—only a volume of expository sketches in Latin, called *Evangelical Notes*, and consisting of comments, in the homily style, on the Scripture lessons appointed for the sacred days of the ecclesiastical year. It is of course not fair to judge his powers by these alone, but, making due allowances for their imperfect form, they hardly sustain the high estimate which Catholics place upon Canisius either as exegete or preacher. Waiving the question of doctrines, the adoration of Mary and the saints, and other distinctively Catholic features, we do not find the depth of thought, accuracy of interpretation, or power of expression which we should expect. Yet the style and spirit are worthy of commendation, and the exegesis marks a notable advance upon the scholastic and allegorical method of former times.

We should naturally expect to find a larger number of great Catholic preachers during this time in Italy rather than elsewhere, and though there is no multitude, the facts justify that expectation.¹ We can, however, from the number of those mentioned by the authorities select only a few of the most important for brief consideration.

Among the preachers of the early part of the century none perhaps had so great a reputation as Egidio da Viterbo (d. 1532). The place of his birth is uncertain, but his surname suggests Viterbo. He seems to have been of humble but respectable origin, but little is known of him until, in 1488, he joined the Augustinian monks. After this he spent some time in studies at various places, including Padua, Florence and Rome. He was fond of Platonic philosophy and gave lectures at Florence. Already, in his young manhood, he preached at Rome with applause, and won the favorable notice of Pope Alexander VI., whose favor, indeed, may not be considered any special compliment, except for his capacity to discern

¹ For the Italian preachers of the period I have chiefly used the following authorities: Zanotto's *Storia della Predicazione*; a bright critical introduction to an *Antologia della Sacra Eloquenza Moderna*, da Ulisse Micocci; notices in the appropriate volumes of Tiraboschi's great *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*; articles in *Encyclopedia Italiana*; Cardinal Fred. Borromeo's *De Sacris nostrorum Temporum Oratoribus*; and to some extent the works of the preachers themselves, as far as available.

talent. He was highly esteemed by the Franciscan Genazzano, the rival of Savonarola, and accompanied him to Naples in 1498, where Genazzano died and Egidio was very ill, but recovered, and his preaching attracted great notice. King Ferdinand of Naples sent him to many places in his dominions to preach, and indeed his fame spread all over Italy. His services were in such demand as preacher during Lent and other seasons that Pope Julius II., it is said, reserved to himself the right of giving Egidio his appointments. This pope also employed him on a confidential mission to Venice. He also served ten years as General of his order. Leo X. greatly admired him, and made him a cardinal in 1517. Such eminent scholars and critics as Bembo and Sadolet speak in the highest terms of his talents and eloquence, and there can be no doubt of his learning and eminence as a preacher. But his sermons seem to have perished in the sack of Rome under Charles V., and no specimens of his pulpit work have survived.

Passing over several men of some note who flourished in the early decades of the century with and after Egidio, we come to a group of three whose work lay from the middle toward the end of the age. First of these is the much-praised Cornelio Musso (d. 1575), who was born in 1511, of good family, at Piacenza. At nine years of age he entered as a novice the Franciscan order, received his early education at their convent at Carpi, showing both diligence in study and promising oratorical talent. While a youth of nineteen he was invited to Venice, and on Annunciation day in the Cathedral of San Marco preached a sermon to the wonder of all hearers. But, like young Bossuet afterwards, he was not unwisely seduced from study by this early recognition of his powers, but the rather devoted himself to his books. In 1530 he went to Padua, where he studied hard under good teachers, making progress in Greek and Hebrew, as well as other branches, and in philosophy and oratory. During all this time he was preaching much, and was heard with admiration.

Soon he was called as preacher to Milan, and also held a lectureship at the University of Padua. Later he lectured on philosophy and theology at Bologna, all the

while being much in demand as preacher in various places. In 1541 he is found at Rome, where he is highly regarded by the pope, who frequently takes counsel with him on important questions of theology. As a reward he was made bishop, first of Bertinoro, and then of Bitonto, under which appellation he is best known. It fell to Musso to preach the opening sermon at the famous Council of Trent, and he discharged that duty in a way to win extravagant eulogies from the assembled prelates, showing himself, as Tiraboschi says, "at once a profound theologian and eloquent orator." After the Council of Trent he returned to his bishopric of Bitonto, and was diligent as bishop and preacher there for some years, but was later called to Rome by Gregory XIII., and died there, in 1575.

A selection of ten of his sermons was published as early as 1554, and a number of discourses on various subjects appeared later. Many of them were translated into Latin, Spanish, and French. They had wide circulation, and were much praised by excellent critics among the Catholics. Still, to our thinking, the sermons would be by no means models for imitation, being rather long and minute in some details, not remarkably well arranged, and not always in good taste. Yet, according to Tiraboschi: "If Musso be compared with his predecessors, he is to them like gold to earth."

Not an orator, but a man of high character, a prelate of distinction, a useful preacher and helper of preaching, was St. Charles Borromeo of Milan (1538-1584). He came of a distinguished family in north Italy. He was a faithful student, though at first somewhat slow. The pure and pious lad was early designed for the clerical profession, and his uncle, Julius Cæsar Borromeo, resigned in the boy's favor an abbacy which had considerable revenues. Already the lad showed signs of the coming reformer and saint, for he requested his father to take charge of these revenues and employ them in charity, while he went on with his studies at Milan and Pavia, and preserved his purity amid the snares of college life. Pope Pius IV. was his uncle, and, availing himself of the talents of his young kinsman, appointed him to great offices in the church. Though very young and not yet

ordained a priest, he was made cardinal deacon and archbishop of Milan. Borromeo did not approve of such abuses, and reluctantly accepted office in obedience to the pope.

As a cardinal and an official in the pope's household, he lived at Rome as befitted his dignity, but felt all the while that he ought to be ordained and take hold of the work of his diocese at Milan. Though only twenty-three years old, he is said to have been the real ruler of the church in the name of Pius IV., and it is claimed that not for a long time had the affairs of the papacy been so well administered. In these times of much responsibility and public business he gave his nights largely to study, and with him as a centre there was a circle of studious men who used to spend their evenings in scholarly converse at the Vatican.

On the death of Charles' elder brother without heir, he was solicited by his kindred, including even the pope, to resign his church offices and marry. But he said he had wedded another bride; and to be rid of the importunities of his relatives he at once consummated his long-deferred ordination as priest and bishop. Having received requisite authority from the pope, he instituted some much-needed reforms in the discipline of the clergy. He also took hold of the dilatory and much-interrupted Council of Trent, and under his skilful influence that body soon accomplished its labors. To him, with others, was committed the preparation of the Tridentine Catechism, that clear and compact standard of Catholic doctrine.

At last, in 1565, he was free to take up his work, performed in his long absence by deputies, as archbishop of Milan. He found things in great disorder, but he soon proved himself almost another Ambrose; and to this day his name is honored at Milan along with that of his most illustrious predecessor. He set the example of self-denial that he required in his clergy. He was diligent in all the work of a bishop, preaching much and administering affairs with a firm and skilful hand. His determined and vigorous discipline made enemies among the less worthy of the clergy, and one of these attempted his life, shooting at him while he was engaged in prayer in the church. But the bullet somehow did not take effect,

and his escape was accounted a miracle. When the plague desolated Italy and visited Milan the archbishop was away, but on its appearance he promptly returned to his post of duty and labored in visitation and charities. He escaped the plague, but not long after fell sick of a fever and died in 1584.

As a preacher, so far as gifts of oratory are concerned, Borromeo cannot be ranked with Musso and Panigarola, but he was as diligent and conscientious in this part of his work as in other things. His sermons were instructive, and spiritually helpful to his people. Of course, one of the leading theologians of Trent was a thorough-going Catholic in doctrine. His voice and utterance were not specially pleasing, but his knowledge of human nature, his earnest spirit, the thoughtfulness of his matter, and the weight and elevation of his character gave to his preaching a power which mere graces of rhetoric could not have brought. His great interest in preaching and the reforms he instituted in that department, apart from his own work in the pulpit, give him a worthy place in the history of preaching.

Toward the close of the sixteenth century the most popular and famous Italian preacher was Francesco Panigarola (1548-1594). Born at Milan, of gentle family, he received careful training in youth, and early gave evidence of a remarkably retentive memory and of oratorical powers of a high order. He studied law for some years at Pavia and Bologna, leading at the same time a somewhat loose life. Recalled to serious thoughts by the death of his father, he determined to preach, and in 1567 he joined the Franciscan order and soon became noted for his preaching talents. In 1571 he went to Paris for further theological education, and while there preached with acceptance before Catherine dei Medici. After spending some time at Lyons and Antwerp, he returned in 1573 to Italy, and during the following years, while preaching much, also taught theology in various convents of his order. He passed two years with Borromeo at Milan, who highly regarded him and used him in preaching. Later Panigarola was appointed to a bishopric, but, through envy, he was falsely accused, and suffered somewhat in reputation for a while. The

charges against him not being sustained, he was promoted in 1587 to the bishopric of Asti. Soon afterwards he was called to Paris to help the Catholic cause there as one of the preachers of the League, which his ready acquaintance with French enabled him to do with credit. In 1590 he returned to his diocese, which he administered with diligence till his death, a few years later.

Panigarola had a fine voice and figure and a flowing, pleasing style of speech, but the critics find him somewhat artificial and seeking after effect. His arrangement is usually clear and good, and the expression fluent and agreeable. Tiraboschi considers his fame well founded, but Zanotto is scarcely so sure of it; and if the specimens of his work given by the latter are fair samples of his manner, there is far more evidence of fluency than of depth either of thought or feeling.

Spain was less affected by the Reformation than any other Catholic country, and it is just what we should expect when we find the distinctive Catholic preaching more prominent than in Germany or even in Italy. Of the preachers who were active during the sixteenth century three at least are deserving of special notice: Juan de Avila, Luiz de Granada and Thomas de Villanova.

The most evangelical of the three was the so-called "Apostle of Andalusia," Juan de Avila (d. 1569). He was of humble but respectable birth, received his education at Salamanca and Alcala, and devoted himself with zeal and success to preaching, more especially in Andalusia. He loved to preach to the common people, and his converts were numbered among the thousands. He desired to go as a missionary to the East Indies, but was urgently dissuaded by the archbishop of Seville, who wished to retain his rare preaching talent for the work at home. He began to preach at Seville, but visited many other towns. It is said that he could move his hearers by a single word, by a look even. His wonderful success aroused envy, he did not escape attack, but the Inquisition could not find the charges justified. He refused various high church offices, but was highly regarded in his life and after his death. Many of his sermons were translated into various languages. The abbé Boucher¹ says of him: "We have of him sermons in

¹ *L'Eloquence de la Chaire*, etc.

which there is found much of dash, of warmth, and of passion. But rapidly improvised, they leave much to be desired in respect to form."

Famous both as preacher and as author of devotional books, praised by popes and saints, and admired by literary critics, in his own country, was Luiz de Granada¹ (1504-1588). He was born of poor parents at Granada, in 1504. One day he and another boy had a quarrel, which soon came to blows. A Spanish nobleman witnessed the affair and parted the lads, whereupon Luiz stated his side of the case and pleaded his cause with such good reasoning and eloquence that the count was impressed by the boy's talents, and became so much interested in him that he was allowed to pursue his studies along with the gentleman's sons without charge. At nineteen years of age Luiz entered the Dominican order, of which he became a distinguished ornament. He studied philosophy and theology at the University of Valencia. He worked for his order in various ways, but chiefly as teacher and preacher. He was greatly admired and beloved among all classes. Catherine, the sister of Charles V., offered him a bishopric, and the pope desired to make him a cardinal, but he declined all offers of ecclesiastical preferment, and remained, first of all, a preacher, though he also wrote numbers of books. After a life of industry and devotion he died at Lisbon in December, 1588.

Among his writings the *Guide to Sinners* is considered the best, of which a Catholic author said that it led more sinners to God than it contained letters. One of the leading Spanish literary critics is quoted as saying: "Never has a devotional author spoken with such dignity and sublimity of God. When he pictures our weakness and poverty over against the almightiness and compassion of God, when he represents his infinite love and our ingratitude, he is great, sublime, incomparable. He is among the mystics what Bossuet was among the orators." The same critic praises his style as uniting charm

¹ Short notices in Zanotto and Boucher, *opp. citt.*, various encyclopædia articles, preferably the one in Wetzer und Welte; and best of all some of the works of Luiz himself in Latin, namely, his *Rhetorica Ecclesiastica*, and a beautiful old edition of his sermons, *Conciones de Temporibus*, etc., printed at Antwerp in 1584, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

with ornament, and compares him to Chrysostom in ease, clearness, richness, fulness. On the other hand Rothe,¹ the German Protestant, is not so enthusiastic, for, though admitting the oratorical talent of Luiz, he declares him deficient in training and in taste, and says his sermons lack order and are overloaded with images, comparisons, legends and the like. The truth lies between these extremes of praise and censure.

Beside his books of devotion and his sermons, Luiz published an interesting and, in its time, useful work on the art of preaching, under the title, *Rhetorica Ecclesiastica seu de Ratione Concionandi*. The treatise has not much originality, but shows easy grasp of the principles of rhetoric and a careful reading of the best ancient treatises—Aristotle, Demetrius Phalereus, Cicero, though, apparently, not Quintilian—and also of Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*. He treats the usual subjects of Invention, Arrangement, Style and Delivery with good sense and in clear and agreeable Latin. He earnestly insists, both in the beginning and conclusion, on the character of the preacher as the highest essential to good preaching, and urges devotion to Christ and absorption in him in the act of preaching.

The sermons of Luiz were preached and many of them published in Spanish, but there are also Latin sermons. A beautiful old edition of these, published at Antwerp in 1584, contains a large number of discourses. The first sermon on the Advent is based on the text Matt. 21:1,2, our Lord's sending the two disciples to find and bring the ass and her colt for his entry into Jerusalem. The preacher first proposes to expound the Scripture lesson and then discuss the reasons why the church celebrates the Advent; but really there are three divisions, thus: (1) Meaning of finding the ass and colt. They signify the Jews and Gentiles—the latter being as yet unbroken to the yoke of the divine law, and all in bondage to sin—"tied," but Christ gives liberty. (2) Why had the Lord need of these humble animals? First, to show his humility; and, secondly, to show his power to deliver, since as already said the asses represent sin-bound people. [The unfolding of this thought is good, notwithstanding

¹ *Gesch. der Pred.*, S. 385 ff.

the way he gets at it.] (3) Reasons for celebrating Advent. The church, like a good mother, provides these sacred seasons for the spiritual enjoyment and profit of her children; and the Advent has, among other blessings, the reminder of the fulfilling of the promises and prophecies of the Messiah. He enlarges upon our blessedness in receiving fully what the Old Testament believers only dimly foresaw.

The five sermons on penance give the Catholic doctrine, but they contain much that is spiritually and morally sound and profitable. The following passage from the introduction to a sermon on the Epiphany will give a slight taste of his style: "Among all the benefits which the unmeasured kindness of God has conferred on the human race this holds the highest rank; that he has deigned to grant to them the saving knowledge of his divinity, without which light no man could savingly know him. For, as no one is able to see the sun without the light of the sun itself, so no one can piously receive God without the aid of God himself. For it is himself to whom we come, and himself by whom we come; he is the way which leads, and the life to which it leads."

One of the very best of the Spanish Catholic preachers was Thomas Garcias of Villanova¹ (d. 1555). He was born in the diocese of Leon in 1487, but his parents having come from Villanova, he was later called by that surname. His father and mother were poor but pious folk, who in their own narrow circumstances always found means to give to the poor, and their example of self-sacrifice and charity made a profound and lasting impression on their son. Thomas received his education at Alcala, the recently founded university of Cardinal Ximenes, and was so successful a student that soon after his graduation he was appointed professor of philosophy there. Later he was called to the older university of Salamanca to the same chair. But he had long had the intention of becoming a monk, and retired from this high position to enter the Augustinian order in 1520 and devote himself to preaching and the direction of souls. His gifts as a

¹ *Conciones Sacrae illustrissimi et reverendissimi D. D. Thomae a Villanova*; Brixiae, 1603; with a Life prefixed. In addition some other notices in various authorities.

preacher attracted attention and his fame began to spread. The warm admirer who wrote the life prefixed to Villanova's sermons thus speaks of his powers: "It is a thing most worthy of the greatest admiration that he was able so freely to satisfy by one and the same discourse men of so diverse minds. These are the divine powers of liquid truth and sincere virtue. Of these I was an eyewitness, who took diligent care never to be absent from a sermon of that man."

Villanova attracted the notice of the emperor, Charles V., who made him one of his preachers, and wished to promote him to higher ecclesiastical dignities. Villanova refused the archbishopric of Granada, but was at last constrained by his superiors to accept that of Valencia. But he entered on his episcopal duties in the spirit of his order, came on foot with a single attendant, and clad in his monk's habit. He immediately began a visitation of his diocese and the reform of abuses. This, as usual, provoked opposition and enmity from the corrupt element of the clergy; but he went on his way. He reserved of his revenues only what was needed for his living, and gave the rest in charity and religious works. All the while he was active and frequent in preaching, and gave to his public ministry the effectual backing of a life of purity and piety. The feebleness of his health prevented his attendance upon the Council of Trent. When about to die he gave to the poor what few personal effects he had, and left orders that the bed on which he died should be given to some destitute prisoner.

The published collection of his sermons, done into Latin, contains about a hundred discourses on various subjects dear to Catholics, more especially those on the Church seasons. Some are on the Song of Solomon, a number in praise of the Virgin, and a good many on the saints, all the way from John the Baptist to Augustine and Ildefonso. One of the best of them is a sermon on the Last Judgment, which discusses the subject in a Scriptural way, as well as with good reasoning, and contains some passages of real power. The introduction runs thus: "Being now about to speak of the solemnity and the manner of the final judgment, I beseech thee, benign Spirit, from on high to fall upon our minds and gra-

ciously infuse the hearts of thy people, that we may have the sentiments worthy of so great a mystery, and that what we may worthily feel we may pour forth in full speech. Put the right and the well-sounding word into my mouth, and let it sound forth from my mouth as from a trumpet to the people of God—thy own speech—so that both the ears of those who hear may tingle, and they be converted to thee, O Lord, lest thy wrath on that day may swallow them up alive.”

Then follows the customary invocation to the Virgin for her intercession, and afterwards the statement of the divisions, which are : (1) The reasons, and (2) the character of the judgment, with appropriate and clear subdivision. In a fine passage—too long to quote entire—he treats of those Scriptures which say that judgment shall be in the hands of Christ, and thus proceeds: “I will not refuse him for a judge whom I have had as a redeemer; the lamb, I say, slain for me, him I request as my judge, him I desire, him I long for with all my strength. I will not accuse him of cruelty, for he is a lamb; I will not hold his friendship under suspicion, for he is my brother and my flesh; nor will I fear for his rectitude, for he is God himself. I will not refuse to appear at the tribunal of him who did not disdain to stand for me at the tribunal of a wicked judge. Whatever he has decreed for me I will willingly receive. Therefore, O most mighty Father, give the King thy judgment! Let him be my judge, who for me was judged.” Though he comforts thus, the preacher does not fail to warn against false confidence, saying: “But although I would say these things, let no one, my brethren, let no one deceive himself, let no one sleep, let no one become hardened in sin, in hope of forgiveness; for cursed is he who sins in hope.”

In truth, Villanova was a preacher of decided merits. The published sermons, while they do not justify extravagant praise, do exhibit the essential qualities of good preaching—they show a warm and pious heart, a good head for reasoning, good knowledge of the Scriptures, usually a clear analysis, an elevated and at the same time intelligible and impressive style. A Protestant cannot subscribe to his doctrine, and will find other things to demur to in many expressions and turns of thought, but no one

who reads his sermons can fail to feel their devout spirit and their oratorical power. And thus with him, as an unusually fit example, we may close our survey of the Catholic preaching and preachers of the sixteenth century.

CHAPTER XVI

PREACHING AT THE THRESHOLD OF THE MODERN WORLD

Our studies have conducted us to the threshold of the modern world. The sixteenth century is the beginning of modernity, as the fifteenth was the end of mediævalism. Renaissance and Reformation mark the death of one, the birth of the other. Mental and spiritual culture are the strong forces in human development, and these received powerful impulse in the ages named. In preaching, as our studies have shown us, no less than in other important departments of this mental and spiritual culture, the forces which wrought great changes came to a head in this time, more especially in the early part of the sixteenth century. So this is a good place to pause in considering the history of preaching and look backwards and forwards. A summary of the progress made may clear our vision of the past from the maze of detail into which we have necessarily been plunged, and prepare us better to take also a general forward look into the three centuries after the sixteenth—a more detailed study of which is deferred to the future.

I. RETROSPECT

As we look back over the long and varied way by which we have traveled and try to sketch in salient outline the main features of the scenes through which we have just passed, what do we see?

Preaching is distinctively a Christian institution, and yet is founded on certain fundamental things in human character and history. As one of the most widely employed and useful forms of public speech it has held for all the Christian ages an assured place among the institutions of human society. Thus, on rational principles, it establishes a claim for fair and thorough scientific study

and treatment. Thus, too, on the historical side, it has availed itself in its forms and technical principles of all the developments in the art of oratory, and has contributed no mean share of example and instruction to that department of literature. But it is, of course, as a vital element of the Christian religion that preaching finds its highest historic value and interest. It derives its warrant from the divine Founder himself. Its historic origins are traceable to the prophets and scribes of the Old Testament, and to the teaching and example of Jesus and his Apostles. Its burden and message are the good news of salvation by Christ. From its origin preaching has a two-fold character—proclamation and teaching. It proclaims the gospel of Christ to men with a view to their acceptance of him as their Saviour and Lord; and it teaches to those who have so accepted him the lofty morality and the inspiring hopes and consolations which that gospel includes. It brings to men's minds the truth of God, to their wills his law, to their hearts his love. In the very beginning, and ever as time goes on, these two elements of proclamation and instruction are variously combined in the Christian sermon, which as a part of the congregational worship is occupied with the explanation and enforcement of the mind and will of God as revealed in Holy Scripture. From this origin the history of preaching proceeds through the centuries.

The accounts and remains of preaching in the times immediately following the Apostles are very meagre, but we know that there was preaching of both the evangelistic and didactic sort. As those who could bear oral witness to the main facts of the gospel history passed away, and the authoritative teachers appointed directly by the Master himself died off, the exposition of the written Word became more and more the essence of preaching as a part of Christian worship. With the spread of the gospel and the rapid acquisition of converts, both by personal exertions and more public discourses, the assemblies for worship and hearing became larger and more varied in character; and thus the combination of proclamation and teaching becomes the fixed character of Christian preaching, the two elements being varied according to circumstances. Naturally, in the assemblies the expository ele-

ment predominates, and we have for centuries, and, in fact, nevermore wholly abandoned, the homily, or explanatory and hortatory talk, as the prevailing type of sermon. All subsequent modifications grew from this germ. The persecutions, which checked large public assemblies of Christians, naturally had the effect of emphasizing this kind of preaching. But somewhat by the Apologists, and more effectively by Origen, and with the intention to put honor upon the sacred Word, the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture was employed in the homilies, and vitiated preaching for ages to come. With the cessation of the imperial persecutions and the protection of Christianity as the religion of the empire under Constantine, a new era for preaching, as for all Christian interests, begins. All the lines of development receive freer opportunity for extension, and there is especial emphasis upon the oratorical element because of two things: one is the change in the character of the congregations to large public assemblies; the other is the better opportunity offered to preachers for being trained in the culture of the age, a culture chiefly rhetorical. The preacher may now add to his duty of expounding God's Word in Christian assemblies the larger office of being a censor of public morals and the orator before a multitude. These functions—inherent in the ancient prophecy—have never been lost to the pulpit, though sometimes neglected and sometimes abused. This line of development reached its acme in Chrysostom, in the fourth century, whose unrivalled homilies were also often eloquent orations and noble pleas for truth and good morals. The theological and philosophical element of preaching, begun long before in the Apologists, found among the Greeks an able exponent in Gregory of Nyssa, and among the Latins in the incomparable Augustine, whose various and numerous writings contain many homilies full of thought and spiritual power. Toward the close of the patristic period, after the times of these great men, preaching suffered decay. This was partly natural reaction, but was terribly assisted by the tottering and fall of the Western empire, and the serious and incurable enfeeblement of the Eastern.

The upheaval of Europe and the overthrow of the old

Roman civilization under the Teutonic barbarians in the early part of the Dark Ages were serious hindrances, along with inner decline, to the continuance of preaching, much more to its further development. But, in a way, it persisted through all the chaos and confusion of the times; and there were preachers who held it to the previous forms without adding anything of value to them. Monasticism encouraged the mild contemplative life, and here and there a Bede gathered his pupils about him and, after the manner of Origen, gently expounded to them the Word of God. Here and there devoted missionaries like Patrick, Gall, Boniface, went among the heathen or half-heathen, and preached and taught them the gospel as they received it. Here and there a prelate like Eligius of Noyon added to episcopal duties the preaching of the Word, and encouraged by example and teaching the preservation of this vital part of Christian work. Charlemagne, enlightened ruler and far-seeing statesman, was distressed at the decay of preaching and passed rules for improving both its frequency and its quality. But these reforms from the outside had no great effect, and with the failure of Charlemagne's empire after his death, the temporary improvements in the clergy and preaching likewise fell away. The darkness thickens till once more a new period dawns.

In the eleventh century two powerful influences upon the history of preaching come into play. One was the rise of the scholastic theology, with Lanfranc and Anselm, and the other, near the end of the century, was the proclamation of the first crusade by Pope Urban II. and Peter the Hermit. The first came from within and gave to preaching for three or four centuries its characteristic method on the technical side, that is, minute analysis, subtle speculative reasoning on the basis of accepted and authoritative church doctrines. Permanent influence was exerted on preaching in the way of arrangement and form, a method which went to extremes, but has left abiding traces for good in insisting on clear structure and logical reasoning in sermons. The other influence came from without, in the call of the crusades, but was no less effective in a different way. Urban's stirring addresses to the

assembled nobles at Clermont, and Peter's vehement appeals to the multitudes, revealed once more the power of human speech to rouse men to action, and gave a much-needed impulse to popular preaching. This, too, produced important results, and left permanent influence both for good and ill. Later the mystical impulse from the monastic and contemplative side brought its less impressive and less extensive influence to these, and added, in the general preaching of the age, that spiritual and thoughtful tone which was needed to complete, if not counteract, the other two. All these elements of preaching were represented in Bernard, the greatest preacher of the twelfth century. Early in the thirteenth century the two missionary preaching orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis were started, and gave a powerful emphasis to popular preaching. Members of these orders went all over Europe, and even into foreign lands, preaching with an enthusiasm and effect unknown for ages, and were heard by gathered thousands of people. Nor did these orders neglect the scholastic and mystical trends of thought, as Aquinas, the Dominican, and Bonaventura, the Franciscan, show. Mediæval preaching reaches in the thirteenth century its highest point of excellence and power, but it is still marred by the allegorical interpretation and by the doctrinal perversions and superstitions of the past ages, by the over-employment of saints' legends and other unscriptural material, and by other faults. Decline is already apparent toward the close of the century, and of the three trends of thought the mystical flourishes longest, finding its best expression in the fourteenth century in the work of that saintly man and admirable preacher, John Tauler. But with him this age closes.

Action and reaction, revival and decline, this is history. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were evil indeed for preaching. Every force—scholastic, popular, mystic—that had contributed to the great forward movement of the preceding age fell into degeneracy, extremes, abuses. Pedantry and subtlety without power, popular appeals that sunk to the burlesque, pale and feeble ghosts of former giants, occupied the scene. And along with this mental decline there was a moral laxity in the clergy that is appalling. How could preaching survive

this famine and ever flourish again? All was not hopeless. The gathering forces of reform, feeble and few at first, came to be a mighty army, and early in the sixteenth century effected the greatest religious revolution of history, and gave to preaching a significance and power in the world such as it had had in the fourth and in the thirteenth centuries, and in many important respects far better and greater than in those two culminations. The very year that John Tauler died, a young man in England is ordained a priest. John Wiclif begins his work. The preaching of the Bible is the main thing in his work, personally and by others. He comes to see that many things taught by the dominant church for truth have no warrant in Scripture, and his eyes do not mislead him as to the fearful moral corruption in the clergy. He has the courage of his convictions, and powerfully speaks his mind. The seeds of his planting will blossom into flower and fruit at a later day. Meantime, over in the heart of Europe, John Huss of Bohemia gets hold of Wiclif's teachings and they get hold of him, and through him of others. Constance and the stake are his reward; but truth cannot be burnt. Other voices here and there are heard, until after the middle of the century at Florence a Dominican monk makes Italy and Europe listen while, in flaming eloquence, he tells of the corruption and speedy punishment of the church. Savonarola goes the way of Huss, but he, too, is not forgotten. Scarcely twenty years after his martyrdom a young Augustinian monk and professor at Wittenberg, in Saxon Germany, startles the world by a bold attack upon papal indulgences and other abuses. One step leads to another. A chord of slumbering sympathy is touched by a skilful and mighty hand, and it is vibrating still. How quickly they come to the fore, those mighty men and preachers—Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Latimer, Knox, and their fellow-workers and followers. And preaching that seemed dead is now among the liveliest forces in the world. Protestantism is born, and a new era for religion and preaching is begun. Age-long faults and abuses in substance and method are corrected. Preaching resumes its rightful place in Christian worship, it eschews the scholastic extremes while retaining the benefits of the scholastic method; it effects for

itself a wonderful deliverance from the abuses of a false and overstrained mode of Scripture interpretation; it desires to bring home to the people of every grade the Word of God as being, in its rightly understood teachings, the sole and sufficient guide in religious concerns; and, above all, against all perversions and additions it proclaims anew, and with a power and clearness not heard of since the Apostles themselves, the simple gospel of salvation by grace through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. With this restored method and message preaching stands at the threshold of the modern world.

2. PROSPECT

The three and a half centuries from about the middle of the sixteenth to the end of the nineteenth constitute the modern period in the history of preaching. As we know, it has been a rich and powerful epoch in the general history of mankind. Preaching has been no small force in the world during this time, and, as we have just seen, it stood at the beginning of the period revived and newly equipped for the important services which it was to render in this last and greatest epoch in human history. Taking our stand back at the beginning of this modern period, we may look forward to the task of preaching in that coming age, and consider both its developing equipment for its task, and the problems with which it will have to deal.

It will not surprise us to find that, like every other single force in the progress of civilization, preaching will sympathize with the sum of others at each successive stage in its development; that is, it will at every epoch be in touch with the times. But it will unite to the influence of environment the momentum of its past, the established principles of its working methods. In fact, this union of tradition and adaptation assures its readiness for work in every age. Nor should the reflection escape us that a wise balance in these forces is the best equipment. Excess of deference to tradition makes the pulpit stiff, dull, ineffective; excess of deference to environment makes it opportunist, superficial, without lasting fruit. With these general remarks, let us more particu-

larly notice some of the elements of power which Christian preaching will employ in the age which lies before it at the close of the reformatory period.

The two great principles established, or newly emphasized, by the Reformation are the most weighty components of the pulpit's new equipment for service in the modern age; the sole authority of Scripture as a revelation from God, and justification by faith in Christ alone as Saviour from sin. The great body of modern preaching—with due discount for exceptions of all sorts—will be thoroughly pervaded by these two dominant thoughts. Where they are accepted and honored preaching will be strong and fruitful, where they are discredited preaching, however brilliant as oratory, will be meagre of permanent spiritual results. Preaching emerges from the Reformation armed with this double-edged sword, and by this sign it will conquer.

A remarkable feature of modern preaching will be its variety. As a result of the revolt from Rome, and the assertion of the right of private judgment in the interpretation and application of Scripture, there will follow a great variety of churches and preachers. There will now no longer be one only church opposed here and there by more or less feeble sects or audacious leaders; there will now no longer be one authoritatively declared body of doctrine to which all must subscribe, whether they believe it or not, on pain of anathema and the stake. But there will be many bodies of Christians calling themselves churches, and many standards or confessions of faith professing to be derived from the sole authority of the Word of God. The different Protestant bodies in their sum will constitute a formidable denial to Rome's arrogated supremacy, and in their diversities a remarkable contrast to its apparent unity. These "variations of Protestantism" will be one of the stock Catholic arguments against it, but the freedom and variety thus expressed and maintained will prove of more value to true religious life and progress than unreal, because enforced, uniformity and tame monotony could be. In the pulpit this manifold variety is to show itself in methods, aims and effects, as well as in the persons and offices of the preachers. The celibate and the monk will no longer

appear the highest type. The man among men—the pious husband and father, the exemplary citizen, the respected member of society, as well as the teacher of divine truth and moral guide of the community—will henceforth be the best kind of preacher. His personality will become relatively more important, and his character will count for more than in former times. This new age is going to be one of infinite variety and many changes, and will need a flexible and widely varied ministry to meet its wants.

The sketches we have had of the leading reformers show us that for the most part they were men of great force of character and intellect. They took hold of the work and the problems of their time with a vigor that commands respect. Their labors, their success, their example, their principles, require strong men to follow them. Though there will naturally be some falling off in the immediate successors of the reformers, the ministry of the gospel in modern times will on the whole be distinguished for vigor of mind, strength of character, and general ability to deal intelligently and firmly with the problems of the modern pulpit.

The requirements of the new age, and the brilliant example of the leading preachers, alike will work to erect a high standard of ministerial character and culture. One of the principal objects of the reformer's attack was the corrupt, lazy and ignorant clergy. And this very thing forced the reformers to raise and maintain a higher standard of clerical conduct and ability. Both morals and culture were to be elevated, and they were elevated. The general standard of spiritual and intellectual culture in the ministry was more improved by the Reformation than by all the capitularies of Charlemagne or canons of reforming councils. This does not say that many bad and ignorant men will not be found, alas! among the preachers of all sects, but it does mean that in this modern period upon the whole the standard of ministerial character and culture will be higher than ever before.

The combination of things which have been spoken of will tend to increase the hold of the ministry upon the people. It is inevitable that the people shall begin to take more interest in preaching when the preachers are

men whose character and learning compel respect, and when their message comes more clearly as the voice of God through his authorized spokesman, who deals directly with his Word and unfolds its meaning. The attendance upon preaching will increase again, and its effect in guiding men to the higher things of religion and morality will be more decided and marked. It is then with such an outfit as has been suggested rather than described, that the pulpit of the modern world faces the problems that are to rise before it. What are they?

Along with all other human interests preaching will suffer from the storms of war. Tried and tested in that stern school it will have power to meet other difficulties. Civil war in France, thirty years of desolation in Germany, civil war and revolution in England, the eighteenth century wars in Europe, revolution in America and France, the Napoleonic struggle, and all the nineteenth century wars—all these to live through! How the pulpit will adjust itself to these strifes, and preach the gospel of peace amid the rude alarms of war is one of its heavy problems; but it will find a way. Sometimes the preacher will be with the armies in the field, in camp and hospital holding up the Prince of Peace above the noise and chaos of strife; sometimes at home amid the anxious and bereaved he will be giving the consolations of grace and keeping men's eyes on the heavenly rest while the earth is racked with contention.

Naturally the exigencies of the Reformation quickened the spirit of debate and polemic as to the doctrines of Christianity. Henceforth the pulpit will be largely concerned with this feature of the religious life. Nor will it be a pleasing or edifying part of pulpit work, though often an unavoidable one. Much ability, some remains of scholastic sophistry, and too often a rancorous and unchristian spirit will mark the sermons of this kind. Alas! one of the hardest lessons for the Christian pulpit to learn will be that of "speaking the truth in love."

One of the side results of the Reformation was the liberty of thought which it encouraged in religious affairs. The reformers, however, were not quick to accept the logical consequences of their principles. Many of them, perhaps most, were intolerant of differences from them-

selves, and Protestant persecutions are an illogical disgrace upon the cause. But the liberty which their principles demanded inevitably had its perils—within the churches it will lead to rationalism—outside it will encourage infidelity. Or rather let us say that among some professing Christians freedom of speculation and criticism will go too far, even to virtual denial of the supernatural origin and exclusive authority of Scripture; and that unbelieving opposition to the Christian revelation will too often pervert liberty into license, and assume a tone of arrogant and often insolent confidence unjustifiable alike by fact or sentiment. All this, preaching will have to meet, and in the nineteenth century the skepticism mentioned will call to its aid the grand achievements in scientific investigation and boldly assail the fundamental verities of Christianity, in the name of the highest thinking and most assured knowledge of mankind. Truly for such a conflict the pulpit will need the best outfit possible and all its best strength of development. Here was lurking a giant whom the reforming fathers could not foresee, but none the less in asserting the principles they did, and holding up the standard they did for the ministry, they were making the best possible preparation for the coming conflict. The preaching, however, of these coming ages is going to show upon the whole an ability to grasp and handle the problem of rationalism and infidelity that its opponents and critics may not willingly admit, but which history will own.

The growth and wonderful developments in the literatures of the modern Christian nations will present a problem of adjustment and mutual service or hindrance to the pulpit. In some respects there will be rivalry, in others stimulus and wholesome interaction. Where doctrine and morals are concerned there will sometimes be sharp conflict, but on the whole preaching and literature will be most friendly. The pulpit will not be overshadowed and displaced, but it will be closely rivalled and often fatigued and discredited by other means of public instruction. Secularism in press and school will by their very rivalry demand the continuance and strengthening of the pulpit. Its relative range will be narrowed, but in that very fact its energies concentrated, and concentrated

not in vain, upon its own proper duties. The world has never yet heard such preaching as it will hear in the nineteenth century. For, notwithstanding the newspaper and the book, the pulpit will still remain in modern times the chief instructor of men in morals and religious truth.

Progress of thought and freedom will, in these three modern centuries, bring with them increasing recognition of the common man in civil and social life. The Christian pulpit from our Lord's own days till now has ever been one of the foremost champions of the rights of the individual man, whether high or low. Of course there have been exceptions, and many here and there among the preachers have been found untrue to this high ideal, but upon the whole the history of preaching shows the general truth to be as stated; and as the pulpit of the Reformation faces its future it looks to a coming glorious record in its advocacy of human rights, its rebuke of oppressive wrong, its encouragement of social ameliorations.

Early in the seventeenth century Protestant America will be born—a feeble infant truly, yet bravely grasping its mighty future with two weak baby hands at Jamestown and Plymouth Rock. Here in the dependent colonial days American preaching will mostly follow in form and method the traditions of the old world; but under the strong impetus of the Great Awakening it will begin to strike out its own way and be getting ready for its mighty work in the nineteenth century. Here the firm establishment of the voluntary principle in the choice and maintenance of pastors, combined with complete religious liberty, will give to preaching such opportunities as it never had before to develop adaptability, variety and strength. And right nobly it will take its work.

Better than in the Middle Ages with Francis and Dominic, better than at the Reformation with the reformers absorbed in pressing matters at hand, the modern Christianity will take hold of the problem of world-wide evangelization—and the pulpit will not be found wanting. Pious Francke at Halle will preach missions as well as charity, obscure but devoted Carey at Northampton will tell his hesitating brethren to attempt great things for God and expect great things from God, a few theological students will hold a prayer-meeting at a haystack in

Massachusetts, and the great foreign missionary movement of modern times will be on. Preachers at home will emphasize the Master's "marching orders," and preachers abroad in all lands of the earth will revive the primitive methods of preaching Christ, not on other men's foundations but among the heathen who never heard the gospel of God's grace. Thus, true to its double mission of proclamation and instruction, the modern preaching will delight to recall the Founder's words: "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth;" nor will it faint before its sublime task as outlined by its greatest representative among the Apostles: "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The author does not attempt the impossible task of giving an exhaustive survey of the vast literature which more or less directly bears on the great subject treated in this volume; nor even to mention all the books which have come in various ways under his notice, or have contributed to his knowledge. Only those, and not all of them, which have been actually used or found specially helpful in the preparation of the work are given. Many works of general and church history which have been consulted are necessarily omitted. The enumeration under II. is more nearly complete than under the other heads. It is hoped the classification and enumeration of the following works may be found of some service to any who may wish to pursue the subject further.

I. WORKS OF A GENERAL NATURE

1. HISTORY. (a) *General*. Histories of the various countries involved. Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*; Duruy's *History of the Middle Ages*; Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*; Weber's *Weltgeschichte*; Lecky's *History of European Morals*; Seignobos, *Histoire de la Civilisation*; Langlois and Seignobos, *Introduction to the Study of History* (translation).

(b) *Ecclesiastical*. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*; Hase, *Kirchengeschichte*; Fisher, *History of the Christian Church*; Kurtz, *Church History*; Newman, *Manual of Church History*; others of similar character. Of special works a few, such as a number of histories of the Reformation, and more particularly: Baird, *Rise of the Huguenots*; Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages in England*; Beckett, *History of the English Reformation*; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*; Stoughton, *Spanish Reformers*; and other similar works.

(c) *Literary and Philosophical*. Cruttwell, *Literary History of Christianity*; Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*; Scherer, *Geschichte der Deutschen Litteratur*; *Histoire Littéraire de la France* (Daunou, Hauréau and others); several histories of English literature. Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*; Weber, *History of Philosophy*; Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*; Preger, *Geschichte der Deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter*. Sears, *History of Oratory*.

2. CYCLOPÆDIAS. (a) *General*. The *Britannica*; the *American*; Ersch und Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*; *Cyclopedia Italiana*; and others.

(b) *Biographical*. *Dictionary of National Biography*; *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*; *Biographie Universelle*; and several others.

(c) *Ecclesiastical*. Herzog-Plitt-Hauck, *Real Encyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchenlexikon*.

3. COLLECTIONS. *Acta Sanctorum*; Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* and *Patrologia Latina*; the Oxford Library of the Fathers; Dods' (T. and T. Clark) edition of the writings of the Fathers; Works of Chrysostom, Augustine and others in the original in some editions; the Christian Literature Series, i.e., the Apostolic Fathers, the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Harnack und Gebhardt. Guillon, *Bibliothèque des Pères*. Brieger und Bess, *Zeitschrift der Kirchengeschichte*. On the Swiss Reformation the excellent *Leben und Ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Gründer der Reformirten Kirche*. Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century, Publications of the Early English Text Society, edited by Robert Morris, LL.D. The Book of Homilies. Collections of Sermons of the different preachers in their works. Fish, *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*; Volume III. of G. P. Putnam's Sons' *The World's Great Orators*.

II. HISTORY OF PREACHING

1. GENERAL. Works which in a way deal with the whole subject: Broadus, *Lectures on the History of Preaching*; Ker, *Lectures on the History of Preaching*; Pattison, *The History of Christian Preaching*; Fleming James, *The Message and the Messengers*; R. Rothe, *Geschichte der Predigt*. Brief biographical notices with specimens of preaching: Lentz, *Christliche Homiletik*; Fish, *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*. Sketches of the history: Christlieb, *Geschichte der Predigt* (article in Herzog, Bd. 18, supplement, much the most complete treatment yet written); Hering, *Geschichte der Predigt* (part of a larger work, *Die Lehre von der Predigt*); the historical sketch in Harnack's *Geschichte und Theorie der Predigt*; sketch in Van Oosterzee's *Practical Theology*; also in Hoppin's *Homiletics*; several others of similar nature. Character sketches: Brömel, *Homiletische Charakterbilder*; Nebe, *Zur Geschichte der Predigt*.

2. EPOCHAL. Paniel, *Pragmatische Geschichte der Christlichen Beredsamkeit* (designed as a complete history, but as it only comes down to Augustine it is placed here; one of the notable books on the subject); Villemain, *Tableau de l'Eloquence Chrétienne au Quatrième Siècle*; Moule, *Christian Oratory during the First Five Centuries*; Neale, *Mediaeval Preaching*; Ammon, *Geschichte der Homiletik*; Albert, *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland bis Luther*; Cruel, *Geschichte der Deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter*; Linsenmayer, *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland von Karl dem Grossen bis zum Anfang des 15ten Jahrhunderts*; Beste, *Die Bedeutendste Kanzelredner der Lutherischen Kirche der Reformationszeitalters*; C. G. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Predigt in der Evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands von Luther bis Spener*; Bourgain, *La Chaire Française au XII^{me} Siècle*; Lecoy de la Marche, *La Chaire Française au Moyen Age Spécialement au XIII^{me} Siècle*; Renoux, *Les Prédicateurs Célèbres de l'Allemagne*; Boucher, *L'Eloquence de la Chaire, ou l'Histoire Littéraire de la Prédication*; Méray, *Les Libres Prédicateurs devanciers de Luther et de Rabelais*; Marengo, *L'Oratoria*

Sacra Italiana nel Medio Evo; Zanotto, Storia della Predicazione nei Secoli della Letteratura Italiana; F. Borromeo, De Sacris Nostrorum Temporum Oratoribus; Blaikie, The Preachers of Scotland from the Sixth to the Nineteenth Century; W. M. Taylor, The Scottish Pulpit.

III. LIVES AND WORKS OF PREACHERS

Much about individual preachers and their preaching has been gathered from the works previously named, and so, to avoid repetition, only additional works are here mentioned.

1. **PATRISTIC.** Works of the Fathers in various editions, both the originals and translations. Life and Times of Chrysostom, by W. R. W. Stephens. Sketches of some of the more notable preachers by Bishop Carpenter, in the *Clergyman's Magazine*, and afterwards gathered into a volume. Sketches of Patrick and other missionaries in Walrond's Christian Missions before the Reformation.

2. **MEDIÆVAL.** Neander, Der Heilige Bernhard und sein Zeitalter; Storrs, St. Bernard; Herkless, Francis and Dominic; Lacordaire, Vie de Saint Dominique; Sabatier, Life of St. Francis of Assisi (translation); Opera SS. Francisci et Antonii (old edition of De la Haye); Fioretti di San Francesco; Locatelli (editor), A New Life of St. Anthony of Padua (translation), also a new edition of the Sermones Dominicales of Antony of Padua, issuing at Padua; Vaughan, Life of St. Thomas Aquinas; Drioux, Opera S. Thomae; Ashley, Homilies of St. Thomas Aquinas; Card. Fanna, Ratio Novae Collectionis Operum S. Bonaventurae; Göbel, Die Missionspredigten des Franziskaners Berthold von Regensburg; Stromberger, Berthold von Regensburg; Life of Wycliffe, by J. L. Wilson, and other sources; Select English Writings of John Wyclif, edited by Thos. Arnold, Oxford, 1869 (the best); Madden, Life and Martyrdom of Savonarola; Villari, Life and Times of Savonarola; Mrs. Oliphant, Makers of Florence; Baccini, Prediche di F. Girolamo Savonarola.

3. **REFORMATORY.** Köstlin, Life of Luther (the original in two large volumes, the translation in abridged form), Luther's Werke, Hauspostillen, Table Talk (Bohn ed.), Luther and Calvin (sermons); Stähelin, Huldreich Zwingli, sein Leben und Wirken; Zwingli's Werke (Schuler und Schultess); Jackson, Huldreich Zwingli; Bullinger's Decades; Chenévière, Farel, Froment et Viret; Calvin, Works (some in Latin and French, and some in English in various editions), Preface to Comm. on Psalms (Latin, a brief account of his life); Beza, Vie de Calvin; Bungener, Jean Calvin, sa Vie son Œuvre et ses Écrits; Benrath, Bernadino Ochino von Siena (translation also); Sermons and Remains of Bishop Latimer, Parker Society's edition by Corrie; Works of Archbishop Cranmer; Sermons of John Bradford; Life and Writings of Ridley, Religious Tract Society; Works of Bishop Hooper; Works of Bishop Jewel; Knox, History of the Reformation in Scotland, and sermon (the only one) in Fish's Masterpieces; McCrie, Life of Knox; Brown, Life of Knox.

INDEX

- Abbey of St. Victor, 216.
 Abelard, 207 f.
 Achelis, 56 n.
 Ælfric, 169 f.
 Ailred, 203.
 Albert, F. R., 148 n., 151 n., 169,
 180 n., 185 n., 188, 190, 201 n.,
 256 n.
 Albert of Brandenburg, 426 f.,
 462, 537.
 Albert the Great, 237 f., 270,
 273.
 Aleth, Mother of Bernard, 208.
 Alfred the Great, 128.
 Allegorical Preaching, 51, 103,
 114, 118, 137, 143, 157, 172,
 190, 212, 230, 244, 265, 527,
 531.
 Allen, A. V. G., 24 n.
 Amalric of Bena, 270, 328.
 Ambrose, 8, 65 n., 94, (Sketch)
 98 ff., 112.
 Ammon, *Gesch. der Homiletik*,
 317 n., 318, 319 n., 324 n.,
 326 n., 334 n., 345 n.
 Amsdorf, Nicholas von, 399.
 Anabaptists, 406 f., 424, 427,
 444, 466 ff.
 Anabaptist Preaching, 468.
Ancient Homily, 37, 42, 44 f.
 Andrew of Crete, 139.
 Anselm, 10, (Sketch) 171 f.,
 177.
 Ansgar, 167.
 Ante-Nicene Theologians, 42 f.,
 47 f.
 Anthusa, Mother of Chrysos-
 tom, 78, 86 f.
 Antony of Padua, 188, 229, 250,
 (Sketch) 252 ff.
 Apologists, 33, 42 f., 45 f.
 Apostles, Preaching of, 23 ff.
 Apostolic Fathers, 42 f.
 Arcadius, Emperor, 62, 89.
 Aristotle, 16, 17.
 Armitage, Thos., 22 n.
 Arnold, Thos., *Ed. of Wiclif's
 Works*, 339 n.
 Arnold of Brescia, 198.
 Assonance, 189, 201.
 Asterius, 74 f.
 Athanasius, 72.
 Aubert, 148.
 Audiences, 39, 68, 192, 228 f.,
 307 f.
 Augustine, 8, 10, 65 n., 93 f.,
 (Sketch) 100 ff., (*De Civitate
 Dei*) 105, 112, 187.
 Austria - Hungary, Reform
 Preachers in, 460 f.
 Aquila, Caspar, 396.
 Aquinas, Thos., 10, (Sketch)
 238 ff., 270, 273.
 Backer, John of, 464.
 Baird, H. M., 450.
 Barbarian Invasions, Effect on
 Preaching, 112.
 Barletta, Gabriel, 302, 303, 313,
 (Sketch) 323 f.
 Basil, the Great, 65 n., 77,
 (Sketch) 78 ff., 112.
 Basil of Seleucia, 117.
 Baum, W., *Life of Capito*,
 425 n.
 Beaton, Cardinal, 511, 513.
 Beckett, W. H., 474, 477 n.,
 485 n., 495 n., 502 n.
 Bede, 131, 138, 147, 187.
 Behmen, 267.
 Bembo, Cardinal, 295, 457, 542.
 Benrath, *Life of Ochino*, 455 n.,
 458.
 Bernard of Clairvaux, 8, 112,
 183, 188, (Sketch) 208 ff.
 Bernardino of Busti, 322.

- Bernardino of Siena, 317 f.
 Bernher, A. (Latimer's Secretary), 493.
 Berthold of Regensburg, 135 n., 229, (Sketch) 256 ff.
 Beste, Wm., *Kanzelredner*, 384, 399.
 Beza, Theodore, 433 n., 440 and note, 442, 445 n., 448, 450 f., 459.
 Biel, Gabriel, 321.
 Bilney, Thos., 488.
 Blaurock, Anabaptist Preacher, 468.
 Bloody Mary, Influence on Preaching, 476.
 Bohemian Reformers, 344 ff., 460.
 Boissier, G., 17 n.
 Bonaventura, 270, (Sketch) 273 ff.
 Boniface (Winfred), Apostle of Germany, 8, 137, (Sketch) 151 ff.
 Bonivard, 438.
 Borgia (Alexander VI), 353.
 Borromeo, St. Charles, 527, (Sketch) 543 ff.
 Boucher, the Abbé, 3, 525 f., 535 n., 546.
 Bourgain, the Abbé, 180 n., 181, 189, 204, 207, 211, 215, 226.
 Bradford, John, (Sketch) 498 ff.
 Brandt, Gerard, 464.
 Brentz, John, 377, 396 f., 417.
 Brethren of the Common Life, 296, 299, 329, 330, 332, 334.
 Briçonnet, Wm., 430 f., 433.
 Briessmann, John, 462.
 Broadus, John A., 5 n., 16 n., 19, 22 n., 24 n., 49, 51 n., 58, 64, 73, 75, 80, 86 n., 100 n., 188, 206 n., 211, 241, 283 n., 309 n., 367, 370, 374 n., 381 n., 449 n., 471, 494, 502 n.
 Brömel, 100 n., 102, 373.
 Bucer. See Butzer.
 Buchanan, George, 513.
 Bugenhagen, John, 392 ff., 465.
 Bullinger, Henry, 371, 373, (*Decades*) 377 f., 382, (Sketch) 411 ff., 424, 459, 477, 497.
 Bungener, F., 433 n., 440 n.
 Bunsen, C. J., 56 n.
 Burlesque Preaching. See Sensational Preaching.
 Butzer, Martin, 373, 374, 424, 427, (Sketch) 428 f., 499.
 Cædmon, 131.
 Cæsarius of Arles, 126, 187.
 Cæsarius of Heisterbach, 260.
 Callistus, 57.
 Calvin, John, 8, 10, 369, 370, 373, 376, 377, 381, (on Butzer) 429, (to Roussel) 431, 435, (with Farel) 436, 439 f., (Sketch) 440 ff., 520.
 Canisius, Peter, 527, 530, 539 ff.
 Canon of Scripture, 40 f., 66.
 Capistrano, John, 317, 349.
 Capito, Wolfgang, 373, 416, (Sketch) 425 ff., 428, 444, 469.
 Cappadocia, 76 f.
 Capuchins, 527.
 Caraffa, 527.
 Carlstadt, 467.
 Carlyle, Thos., 389.
 Carnesecchi, Pietro, 455 f.
 Carpenter, Bishop W. Boyd, 84, 93.
 Carranza of Toledo, 453.
 Cassian, 93.
 Cauvin, Gerard, Father of Calvin, 440, 441 f., 443.
 Cazalla, A., 453.
 Charlemagne, 129, (*Capitularia*) 134, 155.
 Chelchitsky, 460.
 Chenévière, C., 433 n., 439.
 Christlieb, 3, 5 n., 6, 48, 49, 129, 237, 261, 367, 463, 465 n., 526 n., 534.
 Christopher of Alexandria, 159 ff.
 Chrodegang, 134.
 Chrysostom, 8, 65 n., (Sketch) 86 ff., 97, 116, 117, 128.
 Church Buildings, 67 f.
 Cicero, 17, 112.
 Cipriano of Valera, 454 f.

Classification of Preachers—
Parochial, Cloistral and Mis-
sionary, 134 f., 166, 196;
Scholastic, Popular and Mys-
tic, 230 f.

Clement of Alexandria, 36, 49.

Clement of Rome, 44.

Clergy, Corruption of, 164,
224 ff., 297 f., 311.

Colet, John, 295, (Sketch)
342 f., 475.

Collections of Sermons. See
Homiliaries.

Columban, 137, (Sketch) 148 f.

Conrad of Brundelsheim, 261.

Conrad the Priest, 188, 201 f.

Conrad of Waldhausen, 344.

Constantine, Emperor, His
Toleration of Christianity, 63.

Contents or Materials of Early
Preaching, 39 ff.

Controversy, Influence on
Preaching, 111, 132, 367,
374 f., 533 ff.

Cop, Nicholas, 443.

Corvinus, A., 399.

Council of Trent, on Preach-
ing, 525, 528, 532, 544.

Coverdale, Miles, 373, (Sketch)
486 f.

Cranmer, Thos., 373, 374, 378,
429, 456, (Sketch) 482 f., 494,
495.

Cruel, R., 138 n., 148 n., 153 n.,
168 n., 180 n., 185 n., 189 n.,
199 n., 201, 256 n., 307, 309 n.,
319 n., 344 n.

Crusades, Effect on Preaching,
177 f., 221.

Cruttwell's *Literary History of
Christianity*, 55 n., 56 n.

Cutts, E. L., 136 n., 138 n.,
202 n., 203.

Cyprian (Sketch), 58 f.

Cyril of Alexandria, 112, 116,
(Sketch) 117.

Cyril of Jerusalem, 73 f.

Darnley, 519.

Datheen, Peter, 463.

David of Augsburg, 256, 260,
281.

Davidson, Prof. Thos., 17 n.

Delivery of Sermons, 307.

Demosthenes, 16, 112.

Denmark, Reformation Preach-
ers in, 465.

Dévay, Matthias, 461.

Development (Early) of
Preaching, 35 ff.

Diaz, Juan, 454.

Didache, 37.

Dietrich, Veit, 377, 398 f.

Diodorus of Antioch, Teacher,
87, 115, 119.

Dionysius of Corinth, 46.

Dominic, 229, (Sketch) 245 ff.

Dominicans, 229.

Duishuis, Guibert, 463.

Durand, 265.

Eck, John, 468, 528, 536.

Eckhart, 10, 267, (Sketch)
276 ff., 331.

Education of the Ministry,
Earlier Centuries, 67; Re-
formation, 373 f.

Edward VI. and Reform
Preaching, 476.

Edwards, Jonathan, 8, 10.

Egidio, Juan Gil, 452.

Egidio of Viterbo, 541 f.

Eligius of Noyon, 137, 138,
(Sketch) 145 f.

Elinand, 234 f.

Eliot, Geo. (*Romola*), 350 n.

Elizabeth, Queen, Relation to
Preaching, 477.

Emerson, 267.

Ephraem Syrus, 75 f.

Erasmus, Desiderius, 296, 300 f.,
307, 330, 363 f., 403, 416, 426,
454, (in England) 475;
Paraphrase, 478 f., 527.

Eudoxia, Empress, 90.

Eusebius, 37, 42 n., 46, 50, 51,
56, (Sketch) 71 f.

Eusebius of Emesa, 72.

Eutropius, 89.

Expository Preaching, 70, 112,
113, (of Luther, Calvin and
other reformers) 380 ff., 449,
466, (English) 481, 530.

- Faber Stapulensis, 295, 363. See also Le Fèvre.
 Fairs, Preaching at, 221.
 Farel, Wm., 418, 424, (Sketch) 433 ff., 445, 446, 466.
 Featley, Daniel, 508.
 Ferus. See Wild.
 Fichte, 267.
 Fish, H. C., *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*, 5, 59 n., 82 n., 86 n., 338, 381, 492 n., 506 n., 521.
 Foulques of Neuilly, 215 f.
 Fox, Geo., 267.
 Francis of Assisi, 199, 229, (Sketch) 247 ff.
 Franciscans, 229.
 Frith, John, 479.
 Froment, Antoine, 433, 436, (Sketch) 437 f.
 Fulbert of Chartres, 169.
 Fulgentius of Ruspe, 126.
 Fuller, Thos., 265.

 Gall (Saint), 137, 138, 150 f.
 Gaudentius of Brescia, 70, (Sketch) 97 f.
 Geiler, John, of Kaisersberg, 313, (Sketch) 325 ff., 422, 425.
 Genazzano, 542.
 George of Nicomedia, 161.
 George of Pisidia, 139.
 George of Polentz, 462.
 Germanus, 141.
 Gerson, Jean Charlier, (Sketch) 333 f.
 Gibbon, 91, 99, 117 n.
 Gilpin, Bernard, 503 f.
 Göbel, A., 256 n.
Golden Legend, 261 f., 303.
 Goodman, Christopher, 523.
 Goodspeed, E. J., 74 n.
 Grebel, Anabaptist Preacher, 468.
 Gregory I., 8, 108, 113, 127 ff., 187.
 Gregory of Isauria, 158 f.
 Gregory Nazianzen, 65 n., 77, (Sketch) 81 ff., 89, 128.
 Gregory of Nyssa, 10, 65 n., 77, (Sketch) 84 ff.
 Gregory, Thaumaturgus, 54 f.
 Greek Language in the Roman Church, 55.
 Grindal, Edmund, 478, (Sketch) 505.
 Gritsch, John, 319 ff.
 Groot, Gerhard, 296, (Sketch) 329 f.
 Grote's *History of Greece*, 16 n.
 Grynæus, Simon, 416, 422, 444, 461.
 Guelf and Ghibelline, 179.

 Haller, Berthold, (Sketch) 422 ff., 432.
 Hamilton, Patrick, 510.
 Harlow, Wm., 522.
 Harnack, Th. (quoted), 114.
 Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, 24 n.
 Hatch, Edwin, 17 n.
 Hauck, Prof. A., 332 n.
 Haymo of Halberstadt, 168 f.
 Hemmerlin, Felix, 400, 404.
 Henry VIII., Influence on Preaching, 476, (and Latimer) 490 f.
 Henry of Frimar, 265.
 Henry of Lausanne, 218.
 Hering, *Gesch. der Pred.*, 317 n., 334 n., 381 n.
 Hilary of Poitiers (Sketch), 94.
 Hildebert of Tours, 207.
 Hildebrand (Gregory VII.), 156, 177.
 Hippolytus, 35 f., (Sketch) 56 f.
 Historic Origins of Preaching, 13 ff.
 Hoffmann, Melchior, 467.
 Holy Scriptures (Appeal in Reform Preaching), 315 f.
 Homiletics, 188, 304 f., (Helps) 309, 380 ff.
Homiliaries, 187, 199 ff., 304 f.
 Homilies, 41, 137, 172, 199, 466.
Homilies (English), *Books of*, 479 ff., 505.
 Homilies on the Statues, 87 ff.
 Honorius, Emperor, 62.
 Honorius Scholasticus, 199 f.
 Hooper, John, 373, 382 f., (Sketch) 496 ff.

- Hoppin, J. M., 6, 21 n.
 Hort, F. J. A., 24 n.
 Hübmaier, Balthasar, (Sketch) 468 ff.
 Hugo of St. Victor, 216 f., 269 f., 273.
 Huss, John, 291, (Sketch) 345 ff.
 Hutten, Ulrich von, 364.
 Hypatia, 114, 118.

 Ignatius, 43.
 Ildefonso of Toledo, 136, 144 f.
 Innocent III., 179, 224, 231, 235.
 Investiture Controversy, 179.
 Irenæus, 36, (Sketch) 56.
 Isidore of Seville, 136.
 Ivo of Chartres, 207.

 Jackson, S. M. (on Zwingli), 400 n.
 Jacob of Voragine, 261.
 Jacques de Vitry, 235 f.
 James, Fleming, 7, 20 n., 110.
 Jebb's *Attic Orators*, 16 n.
 Jerome of Dungersheim, 305.
 Jerome of Prague, 348.
 Jerusalem, Influence of Its Fall on Preaching, 29, 34.
 Jesus, as a Preacher, 22 f.
 Jewel, John, 373, 383, 478, (Sketch) 506 ff.
 Joachim of Floris, 198 f.
 John the Baptist, 21 f.
 John of Damascus, 133, (Sketch) 141 ff.
 John of Sterngassen, 280.
 John of Vicenza, 261.
 Jonas, Justus, 388, 395 f.
 Jordan of Pisa, 264.
 Jordan of Quedlinburg, 265.
 Joris, David, 467.
 Juan, de Avila, 451, (Sketch) 546.
 Jud, Leo, 370 f., 373, (Sketch) 409 ff., 416.
 Julian the Apostate, 61.
 Justinian, 106, 107.
 Justin Martyr, 10, 37, 46 f.

 Kempis, Thomas à, 296, 329, (Sketch) 332.

 Ker, John, 7, 20 n., 59 n., 283 n.
 Kingsley's *Hypatia*, 114 n., 117 n.
 Klostermann, 52.
 Knox, John, 8, 369, 373, (in England) 502, (Sketch) 512 ff., (Compared with Other Reformers) 513 and 520.
 Köstlin, Julius, *Life of Luther*, 384 n.
 Kratander, 417.

 Lambert, François, 423, (Sketch) 432 f., 510.
 Lanfranc, 171, 177.
 Langlois and Seignobos, 4.
 Langston, Stephen, 233.
 Lasco, John à, 374, 461 f., 472.
 Latimer, Hugh, 371, 373, 378, 382, (Sketch) 487 ff.
 Latin Language in Sermons, 131, 138, 151, 164 ff., 184 ff., 197, 306 f., 530 f.
 Law of Reaction, 109.
 Lawson, James, 524.
 Leander of Seville, 136.
 Lecoy de la Marche, 165 n., 180 n., 184, 185, 193 n., 204, 215, 226, 228, 233, 235 f., 323.
 Le Fèvre, Jacques, 430, 431, 433, 527.
 Lentz, 5, 51 n., 96 n., 117 n., 119 n., 157 n.
 Leo I., 8, 108, 113, (Sketch) 123 f.
 Leonardo of Utino, 318 f.
 Leroux, Abbé, 534, 536.
 Lever, Thos., 477, 503.
 Libanius, Teacher of Rhetoric, 78, 86, 115.
 Lightfoot, J. B., 24 n.
 Lindsay, T. M., 24 n., 37 n.
 Linsenmayer, A., 180 n., 185 n., 189 n., 199 n., 201 n., 256 n., 285 n.
 Literature of the History of Preaching, 5 ff.
 Liturgy, Effect on Preaching, 109 f., 531.
 Longfellow, H. W., 303.
 Lollards, 341, 369, 474 f.

- Lords of the Congregation, 516, 517.
 Lorenzo dei Medici, 295, 352.
 Luiz of Granada, 527, (Sketch) 547 ff.
 Luther, Martin, 8, 335, 364, 369, 370, 372 f., 374, 375, 376, 377, 380 f., (Sketch) 384 ff., 394, 405, 407 f., 462, 520.
- Macarius, 73.
 "Maccaroni Sermons," 323, 325.
 McCrie, Thos., *Life of Knox*, 510 n., 511, 513 n., 516, 520, 521, 522, 523.
 McGlothlin, W. J., 468 n.
 "Mad Men of Münster," 467.
 Maillard, Oliver, 302, 313, (Sketch) 324 f.
 Major, George, 399.
 Mantz, Anabaptist Preacher, 468.
 Marengo, L., 180 n., 185 n., 197, 302, 304, 317 n.
 Margaret of Navarre, 443.
 Martel, Charles, 130, 152.
 Martyn, Henry, 91 n.
 Mary Stuart, 517 ff.
 Materials for Writing History of Preaching, 4.
 Mathesius, John, 377, 399, 460.
 Matthias of Janow, 345.
 Maurice of Sully, 214 f.
 Maximus of Turin, 123.
 Maybaum, Rabbi, 21 n.
 Melanchthon, Philip, 364, 391 f., 417, 422.
 Melito, 46.
 Menno Simons, 471 f.
 Menot, Michel, 302, 325.
 Méray, A., 302, 304, 325 n.
 Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, 52 n., 139 n., 158 n., 159 n., 161.
 Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 94 n., 95 n., 97 n., 98 n., 100 n., 124, 126 n., 127 n., 134 n., 145 n., 147 n., 148, 149, 151, 170 n., 197 n., 199 n., 203 n., 205 n., 207 n., 208 n., 211, 234 n.
 Milicz, John, 344.
 Milton, 91.
- Mirandola, Count of, 352.
 Modet, Herman, 463.
 Monasticism, Influence on Preaching, 135 f., 163 f., 225.
 Monica, Mother of Augustine, 78, 100 f.
 Montalembert, 136.
 Moody, D. L., 229.
 Morgenstern, George, 321.
 Morris, *Old English Homilies*, 136 n., 180 n., 185, 193, 202 f.
 Morton, Earl of (Eulogy on Knox), 520.
 Münzer, Thos., 467.
 Murray, Earl of, 519.
 Musso, Cornelio, 542 f.
 Myconius, Oswald, 373, (Sketch) 419 ff.
 Mysticism, 73, 266 ff., (Women) 269, (in Schools and Cloisters) 269, (Preaching and Preachers) 270 ff.
- Nas, John, 534 f., 536.
 Neale, J. M., 147 n., 168 n., 170 n., 172 n.
 Neander, 180 n., 208 n.
 Nebe, 51 n., 73, 256 n., 370, 372, 384 n.
 Need of a History of Preaching, 7 f.
 Nestorius, 116, 118.
 Netherlands, Reform Preachers in, 463 ff.
 Newman, Cardinal, 473.
 Newman, A. H., 45 n.
 Nicholas of Clemanges, 305.
 Nicholas of Landau, 264.
 Nicholas of Lyra, 265.
 Nicholas Oresmus, 343.
 Nicholas of Strasburg, 281 f.
 Nonna, Mother of Gregory Nazianzen, 78.
 Norbert, Founder of Premonstrants, 213 f.
- Ochino, Bernardino, 455 n., (Sketch) 457 ff.
 Œcolampadius, John, 373, 411, (Sketch) 416 ff., 424, 434, 469.
 Oliphant, Mrs., 350 n.

- Olivetani, Robert, 435, 442.
 Oratorical Development of Preaching in Fourth Century, 62 ff.
 Oratory, 14 ff.
 " Ancient, 15.
 " Greek, 16 f.
 " Latin, 17.
 Origen, 10, 35 f., 37, 48, (Sketch) 49 ff.
 Osiander, A., 370, 398, 399, 462.
 Outline of the History, 25 ff.
- Pacianus, of Barcelona, 96 f.
 Palladius, Peter, 465.
 Paniel, 5 n., 6, 36 n., 51 n., 74, 85, 94 n., 95, 96 n., 97 n., 100 n., 115.
 Panigarola, Francesco, 545 f.
Parati Sermones, 309.
 Parker, Matthew, 373, 477, 487, 504 f.
 Pascal, 211.
 Patriarchs, 108.
 Patrick (Saint), 121 f.
 Pattison, T. H., 7, 22 n., 283 n.
 Paul, the Apostle, 8.
 Pelbart, 321.
 Pellican, 373.
 Peregrinus, 260.
 Perez, Juan, 454.
 Periods of the History, 28.
 Persecutions, 29, 32, 34 f., 62 f.
 Pestalozzi, C., *Life of Jud*, 409, 422 n.
 Peter of Blois, 204.
 Peter of Bruys, 218.
 Peter Comestor, 214.
 Peter Damiani, 170 f., 177.
 Peter the Hermit, 183, (Sketch) 206.
 Peter Lombard, 197, 214.
 Peter of Ravenna, 123.
 Petri, Olaf and Laurent, 465 f.
 Photius, 161 f.
 Plagiarism, 187, 308 f.
 Poland, Refugees and Reformers in, 461 f.
 Pole, Cardinal, 456, 477.
 Polycarp, 43.
 Ponce de la Fuente, 452 f.
 Postil, Postillating, 305 f., 466.
- Prayer-Book (English), Relation to Preaching, 479.
 Preger, *Geschichte der Mystik*, 266 n., 280.
 Preaching and Art, 9.
 " " Education, 11.
 " " History, 8 ff.
 " " Literature, 11.
 " " Modern Life, 558 ff.
 " " Morals, 9.
 " " Philosophy, 9 f.
 " " Science, 10.
 " " Spread of Christianity, 12; Worship, 69.
 Presbyters, Preaching Restricted to, 69.
 Preservation of Early Sermons, 42, 70, 186.
 Proclus, 116.
 Prophecy, 18 ff.
 Protestantism, Effect on Christianity, 365.
- Quadratus, 46.
 Quintilian, 17.
- Rabanus Maurus, 167 f.
 Rabelais, 363.
 Raoul (Radulphus) the Ardent, 183, 189, (Sketch) 206 f.
 Reformation and Preaching, 358 ff., (Effect on Catholic Church) 366, (Particular Relation to Preaching) 366 ff., (in Italy) 455 f., (in England) 473 ff., (in Scotland) 509 ff., (Influence on Catholic Preaching) 525 ff.
 Reformers, (Their Use of Other Means) 369, (Their Diligence in Preaching) 370 f., (Their Use and Estimation of Preaching) 372 ff., (Their Abilities and Training) 374, (Their Use of the Word of God) 376 ff., (Their Homiletical Methods) 380 ff.
 Reform Preaching, 310, 312, 314 f., 336 ff.
 Regulars and Seculars, 164, 224 f.

- Renaissance, 294 f., 362, 527.
 Retrospect and Summary, 552 ff.
 Reublin, Anabaptist Preacher, 468, 469.
 Reuchlin, John, 364.
 Revival of Learning, 294 ff., 362.
 Revival of Preaching in Middle Ages, 181 ff.
 Rhetoric, Study of, and Influence on Preaching, 65 f.
 Richard of St. Victor, 217 f., 269 f., 273.
 Ridley, Nicholas, 373, 478, 485. (Sketch) 494 ff.
 Robert Grosseteste of Lincoln, 234.
 Robert of Lecce, 303, 323.
 Robert of Sorbon, 237.
 Rogers, John, 484 ff.
 Rokytana, 460.
 Roman Emperors, Relation to Preaching, 31 ff.
 Rothe, R., 6, 36 n., 42 n., 56 n., 116, 117 n., 119, 120, 123, 133, 139, 157 n., 162, 203 n., 204, 302 f., 317 n., 319 n., 333 n., 344 n., 534.
 Rothmann, Bernard, 467.
 Rough, John, 503, 512, 514.
 Roussel, Gerard, 431.
 Ruiz, Gregorio, 453.
 Ruysbroek, John, 331 f.

 Sabatier, A., 198 n., 247 n., 250 n.
 Sandys, Edwin, 478, 506.
 Saunier, 435, 466.
 Savonarola, G., 8. (Sketch) 350 ff., (Compared with Other Reformers) 354, 358.
 Schaff, Philip, *Church History*, 56, 61, 66, 75 n., 117 n., 118, 119 n., 128, 143 n., 155 n., 156 n., 161 n.
 Scherer, E., 21 n.
 Schism, Between East and West, 155.
 Schoell, C., 121 n., 170 n.
 Scholasticism, 231 ff., (Decline of) 263 f.
 Schott, E., 198 n., 199.
 Schrenck, E. von, 22 n.
 Sears' *History of Oratory*, 16 n.
 Sensational Preaching in the Middle Ages, 244, 302 ff.
Sermones Dormi Secure, 309.
 Servetus, 447.
 Sickingen, Francis of, 417.
 Sigismund, Emperor, 291, 347 f.
 Simons. See Menno.
 Smith, Geo. Adam, 20 n.
 Social Classes, 131, 133 f., 164, 221 f., 361.
 Sophronius, 139.
 Spangenberg, John, 399.
 Spencer, Herbert, 14.
 Speratus (Spretter), Paul, 462 f.
 Stähelin, R., *Life of Zwingli*, 400 n.
 Stalker, Jas., 20 n., 22 n.
 Staupitz, 335, 385, 527.
 Steinberger, Hans, 460.
 Stephen of Bourbon, 260.
 Stephens, W. R. W., 86 n.
 Storrs, R. S., 208 n.
 Stromberger, C. W., 256 n.
 Surgant, Ulrich, 305, 307.
 Suso, Henry, 279 ff.
 Sweden, Reform Preachers in, 465 f.
 Synagogue, 20 f.
 Synesius, 114 f.

 Tanchelm, 218.
 Tauler, John, 267, (Sketch) 283 ff., 331, 425.
 Tausen, Hans, 465.
 Tertullian, 46, (Sketch) 58.
 Tetzl, 364, 386.
 Theatines, 527.
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 115.
 Theodore Studies, 143 f.
 Theodoret, 112, (Sketch) 119.
 Theodosius the Great, 61 f., 83, 87, 99, 106.
 Theophanes, 162.
 Theophilus of Alexandria, 89, 90, 115.
 Theophilus of Antioch, 46.
 Theophylact, 162.
 Times for Preaching, Earlier Centuries, 68, 192; Middle Ages, 307.

- Tindale, Wm., 478 n., 479,
 (Sketch) 483 f.
 Tiraboschi, 455 n., 457, 541, 543,
 546.
 Translations (English) of the
 Bible, Influence on Preach-
 ing, 478.
 Trüber, Primus, 460.
 Tunstall, Bishop, 483, 504.

 Ulfilas, 76.
 Ullmann, *Reformers before Re-
 formation*, 296, 312, 331 n.
 Universities, 222 f.
 Urban II., 177, 178, 205.

 Valdez, Alfonso, 453.
 Valdez, Juan, 453 f., 456.
 Valentinus, the Gnostic, 49.
 Valer, Rodrigo, 451 f.
 Valerio, 528.
 Van Oosterzee, 3, 6, 463.
 Vaughan, *Hours with the Mys-
 tics*, 73 n., 211, 217 n., 266 ff.
 Veghe, John, 334.
 Vergerio, 455, 461.
 Vermigli, Peter Martyr, 374,
 455 n., (Sketch) 456 f., 458 f.,
 494, 504, 506.
 Vernacular, Use of, 131, 138,
 151, 165 ff., 184 ff., 197, 306 f.
 Villanova, Thos., (Sketch)
 549 ff.
 Villari, *Life of Savonarola*,
 350 n.
 Vincent Ferrar (Saint), 322.
 Viret, Pierre, 433, 434, (Sketch)
 438 ff.

 Virgin Mary, Worship and
 Preaching, 132, 133, 139, 140,
 143, 157, 191.

 Waldenses, 435, 466.
 Waldo, Peter, 218.
 Walrond, F. F., 121 n., 122,
 151 n.
 Walter of Winterbourne, 265.
 Verdena, John, 309.
 Werner of Ellerbach, 201.
 Wesel, John Richsrath, 349 f.,
 425.
 Wesley, John, 8.
 Wessel, John, 296, 330.
 Whitefield, George, 8, 229.
 Wiclif, John, 8, 310, (Sketch)
 336 ff., 473, 474.
 Wild, John, 529, 530, 536 ff.
 William of Auvergne, 260.
 William of Macclesfield, 265.
 Willibrord, 137, 152.
 Willock, John, 522 f.
 Wishart, George, 511.
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 475, 490.
 Wyttenbach, Thos., 401, 416,
 425.

 Ximenes, Cardinal, 292, 451.

 Zanotto, F., 197, 317 n., 525,
 541 n., 546.
 Zell, Matthew, 425, 427, 428.
 Zeno of Verona, 96.
 Zwickau Prophets, 467.
 Zwingli, Ulrich, 369, 370, 373,
 376, 382, (Sketch) 400 ff.,
 469, 470, 520.

THE PREPARATION AND DELIVERY OF SERMONS

JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D., LL.D.

28th EDITION

ENTIRELY REVISED FROM THE AUTHOR'S OWN NOTES BY

PROF. E. C. DARGAN, D.D.

Author of "A History of Preaching"; Professor of Homiletics at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., etc.

Complete Index, Crown 8vo, Cloth, 582 Pages. \$1.75

THIS new edition of the work of a very able teacher, who had a practical knowledge of his subject and was intimately acquainted with all parts of it, while treating the whole with devoutness, thoroughness, blended scholarship and good sense, will still further enhance the value of an important standard book. The work not only meets the wants of students and young ministers, but is very suggestive and stimulating to those of maturer age. It takes unusual care to give suggestions for the preparation and conduct of what is called extemporaneous discourse, while doing full justice to all the methods.

Prominent Opinions of the Book

BISHOP J. F. HURST: "A most valuable work in a difficult and delicate department of theological study."

BISHOP JOHN H. VINCENT: "The book of Dr. Broadus is everyway admirable."

BISHOP E. R. HENDRIX: "The best work on Rhetoric extant."

THE WATCHMAN: "One of the best volumes on the subject that has been given to the world."

THE PRESBYTERIAN: "A widely popular text-book on Homiletics."

This book has been adopted for teaching in Japanese missions and has been translated into Portuguese and Chinese.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON, NEW YORK

4403 052



~~JUN 1 1991~~

~~JUN 3 1991~~

SEP 10 1996

BF4207 .D32
A history of preaching
Andover-Harvard

AGL0086



3 2044 017 227 661

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

DARGAN, Edwin Charles

AUTHOR

A History of preaching

TITLE

Call Number

BV

4207

.D32

v.1

